


For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Alberta Library

<https://archive.org/details/Reid1971>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE ROLE OF THE
SCHOOL LIBRARIAN IN ALBERTA

by



HELEN AUDREY REID

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1971

ABSTRACT

This study sought to clarify the role of the school librarian in Alberta by identifying task expectation differences and similarities which existed among the librarian and his referent groups. It also sought to determine the areas in which actual librarian performance met or failed to meet the expectations of the librarian and his referent groups.

Six hypotheses were formulated to serve as the basis for the study. Three of these were concerned with a comparison of the opinions of librarians, principals and teachers regarding the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory. The other three were concerned with a comparison of actual practice, as reported by the librarian, with the expectations of librarians, principals and teachers.

The sample for the study included librarians, principals and teachers, randomly selected from all Alberta schools where full-time librarians were employed. On a questionnaire consisting of fifty-five possible librarian's tasks all respondents registered the degree of obligation which they felt to be associated with each task, and librarians also indicated the degree to which each task was actually performed. A five point Likert scale, in which response categories were weighted in direct proportion to the

degree of obligation or fulfillment, was used to measure responses.

A frequency distribution was prepared, and the mean and the standard deviation were computed for each task. Tasks were then rank ordered according to the size of the means. Spearman's Rho, used to measure over-all agreement regarding the rank ordering of the tasks, revealed significantly high correlations between the opinions of all pairs of groups and between group opinions and actual practice.

However, the t test, used to identify tasks in which differences existed at the .01 level of significance, revealed considerable disagreement. A greater number of differences occurred between group expectations and actual practice than among the expectations of the three groups. When ideal perceptions for each task were compared between pairs of groups, greatest disagreement was found to exist between librarians and teachers. Considerable disapproval of current librarian performance was evident for all groups.

Disagreement between librarians and teachers was most extensive in the areas of educational tasks, to which librarians attributed more importance, and non-professional tasks, to which they attached less importance than did teachers. Librarians, principals and teachers generally desired more emphasis to be placed on educational and administrative tasks. Librarians and principals advocated that less of the librarian's attention be devoted to non-professional tasks, but teachers did not concur in this opinion.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express sincere appreciation for the generous help and guidance given by Dr. James B. Bell, advisor for the thesis. Thanks are also extended to members of the thesis committee, Mr. John G. Wright and Mr. Laurie G. Wiedrick for their assistance in the completion of this thesis.

The writer is also indebted to the school superintendents, principals, librarians and teachers whose co-operation made this study possible.

The advice and assistance of the writer's husband, Jack, in the development of the statistical design for the study, is also gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, I would like to thank Mrs. Marilyn Wahl for her work in typing this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE	2
	BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY	3
	NEED FOR THE STUDY	9
	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	12
	HYPOTHESES TESTED	13
	DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	14
	DEFINITION OF TERMS	14
	LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	15
	PLAN OF THE STUDY	16
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	17
	ROLE THEORY	17
	LITERATURE RELATING TO THE SCHOOL	
	LIBRARIAN'S ROLE	21
	Research	21
	Theoretical Writings	33
	SUMMARY	44
	Guidelines Drawn From the Literature .	45
IV.	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	47
	SELECTION OF RESPONDENTS	48
	THE INSTRUMENT	49
	COLLECTION OF DATA	51

Chapter	Page
TYPE OF ANALYSIS OF DATA	53
Spearman's Rank Correlation	
Coefficient	54
The t Test	54
Analysis of Variance	56
The Welch Test	56
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	57
HYPOTHESES TESTED	57
COMPARISON OF LIBRARIANS', PRINCIPALS' AND	
TEACHERS' COMPOSITE ASSESSMENT OF THE	
SCHOOL LIBRARIAN'S TASKS	65
COMPARISON OF GROUP OPINIONS AND OF	
OPINIONS WITH ACTUAL PRACTICE ON	
INDIVIDUAL TASKS	67
Administrative Tasks	69
Educational Tasks	86
Technical Tasks	109
Non-professional Tasks	116
SUMMARY	130
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	134
Purpose of the Study	134
Design and Conduct of the Study . . .	135
Findings Relating to the Hypotheses .	136
Summary of Findings	155
CONCLUSIONS	160
RECOMMENDATIONS	162

Chapter	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY	167
APPENDICES	172
APPENDIX A:	173
B:	182
C:	189

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Responses by Groups Included in the Study . .	53
2.	Comparison of the Expectations of Librarians, Principals and Teachers Regarding Possible Tasks of the School Librarian	59
3.	Comparison of Actual Performance with Expectations of Librarians, Teachers and Principals Regarding the Degree of Obligation and Relative Importance of the Tasks	62
4.	Spearman's Rank Correlations for Group Rankings	66
5.	Administrative Tasks for Which Ideal Perceptions Differed between Groups at the .01 Level of Significance	70
6.	Administrative Tasks for Which Ideal Perceptions Differed from Actual Practice at the .01 Level of Significance	71
7.	Educational Tasks for Which Ideal Perceptions Differed between Groups at the .01 Level of Significance	87
8.	Educational Tasks for Which Ideal Perceptions Differed From Actual Practice at the Level of Significance	89
9.	Technical Tasks for Which Ideal Perceptions Differed between Groups at the .01 Level of Significance	111
10.	Technical Tasks for Which Ideal Perceptions Differed from Actual Practice at the .01 Level of Significance	112
11.	Non-professional Tasks for Which Perceptions Differed between Groups at the .01 Level of Significance	118

Table

Page

12.	Non-professional Tasks for Which Ideal Perceptions Differed from Actual Practice at the .01 Level of Significance	119
13.	Number of Tasks in Which There Were Significant Differences between Groups . .	131
14.	Number of Tasks, by Category, in Which Significant Differences Were Revealed between Groups	131

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Education has undergone momentous change in the past quarter-century. This change is evident in many ways, one of the most conspicuous being the new and more important place assumed by the library in the educational scheme. From the former storehouse for books has emerged an instructional materials centre which ideally accommodates purposeful activity and serves as the hub of learning for the school. As a result of this development and change in the school library, the role of the librarian has altered. From the former custodian of the books has emerged, in theory at least, a generalist who is versed in curriculum matters and skilled in all aspects of librarianship. This new type of librarian is seen by modern theorists to make an active and significant contribution to the total instructional program.

However, since school board policy with respect to the role of the librarian is general in nature and provides no precise statement of duties, the manner in which the librarian operates is a function of all the forces within his milieu. The rapidity of the development of school libraries and the recency of the establishment of the position of school librarian in Alberta contribute to the

ambiguity and uncertainty surrounding the post. The perceptions held by the librarian of the expectations of teachers and principals influence his behavior in the performance of his duties. His role enactment is often a compromise between these divergent expectations and thus is subject to criticism and conducive to conflict.

STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to investigate the differences in opinion which exist among the librarian and his major referent groups regarding the degree to which his various tasks should be mandatory. It further investigated the differences between the role expectations held by the librarian and his referent groups and the role which the librarian reports himself actually to fulfill. More specifically the purposes were as follows:

1. To determine the opinions of librarians, principals and teachers concerning the degree to which possible tasks of the school librarian should be mandatory.
2. To determine the differences in opinion regarding the tasks of the librarian which may exist among these groups.
3. To determine the degree to which the tasks of the librarian are actually performed as reported by the librarian.

4. To compare the expectations of the three groups with the actual performance of the librarian in order to determine where opinions imply support of current practice, and where they imply criticism.

BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

The dramatic changes which have occurred in education in general must be considered in order to understand their impact on the function of the library. New approaches in curriculum theory and their popular acceptance have provided the thrust behind these changes.

In the first quarter of this century school libraries were scarce in North America and virtually non-existent in Alberta. Where they existed, they were confined largely to secondary schools and served primarily as book repositories.

The theories of John Dewey and the interpretation which was popularly given them ushered in the era of progressive education in the nineteen thirties and forties.¹ The advent of progressive education with its emphasis on individual differences and personal and social development provided the initial impetus for a wider role for the school library. In the Forty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, published in 1943,

¹John Dewey, Experience and Education (New York: Macmillan Co., 1938).

Gray states:

. . . the school library has recently assumed a far broader role at all levels of general education than was true in the past. This is due to the increasing demands made on individuals in contemporary life, to the enriched curriculum now provided in the schools, and to the effort to adjust instruction to the varying backgrounds, capacities and needs of pupils.²

Though an expanded role for the library in education began to take shape at this time, progress was only gradual. It was not until the fifties that dynamic and widespread development occurred. The course of world events at this time caused national attention in the United States to focus on education, and precipitated the changes which rapidly spread and diffused. The vast expansion of knowledge, the burst in technology, the upsurge in automation and the possibility of job obsolescence changed the objectives of education and pointed to a need for a re-examination of educational practices and purposes. The shock of Russia's outdistancing America in technology, as evidenced by Sputnik I, caused an alarmed re-evaluation of the nation's schools.

The Rockfeller Report, published in 1958³ and the

²William S. Gray, "Social and Educational Changes Affecting the Library," The Library in General Education, Forty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943), p. 26.

³The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America, (America at Mid-Century Series, Special Studies Project Report V, Rockfeller Brothers Fund. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1958).

writings of such men as James Conant⁴ focused attention in the United States on the need for greater intellectual achievement in the schools. A reform movement in curriculum was initiated, with far-reaching and pervasive effects. The discipline-centred approach, as it came to be called, sprang from scholars in the field, who, confronted by the mounting problem of selection amid a spiralling accumulation of knowledge, strove to find selective criteria. The position of this school of thought is, in essence, that the inherent structure of any discipline is the only proper source of learning content. This thesis has been developed and elaborated by Bruner⁵ and Phenix,⁶ among others. According to Bruner, ". . . the curriculum of a subject should be determined by the most fundamental understanding that can be achieved of the underlying principles that give structure to that subject."⁷ Phenix declares, "If learning time is to be economized, all materials should come from the disciplines and none from other sources."⁸ The structure of

⁴James B. Conant, The American High School Today (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1959).

⁵Jerome S. Bruner, The Process of Education (New York: Random House, 1963).

⁶Philip H. Phenix, Realms of Meaning (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).

⁷Bruner, op. cit., p. 31.

⁸Phenix, op. cit., p. 54.

each discipline is seen to consist of sequential, related concepts which can be patterned so that basic understandings will build one upon another. Each discipline is believed to have an implicit strategy of inquiry which was followed in its initial development, and should be followed in teaching and learning.

The implications of this curriculum approach were manifold with respect to the library. Since it became evident that mastery of all detail was no longer humanly possible, emphasis was placed on understanding the structure of subject matter. Emphasis was also placed on learning how to learn through structure. The strategy of discovery implicit in the discipline was to be communicated to the student so that his learning then and in the future might follow this structured path. Thus through the discipline approach, the student would be better equipped to learn and would assume greater self-direction in his learning tasks. The implementation of this theory could not be accomplished within the framework of the traditional textbook-oriented classroom and limited library. The child could not discover concepts and arrive at understandings by himself if he had nowhere to pursue his expanding and deepening interests. A much greater number and variety of books and materials was required for this approach. The solution appeared to lie in a whole new approach to libraries. Inasmuch as this theory has been widely accepted during the past decade, there has been a trend toward a new concept of the school library.

Another facet of curriculum theory underscored the need for an expanded role for the school library. Although the experience curriculum had fallen before the curriculum reform movement, certain tenets of its philosophy were never discarded. The importance of the individual, his special needs, abilities and interests remained prime considerations. Efforts to provide for these individual needs and aptitudes further changed the role of the school library. The practice whereby each child studied the same facts from the same book by the same method had little concern for the individual. Provision had to be made for differences in reading rate, audio or visual orientation, rate of learning, and a host of other variables. The library was an obvious tool to fulfill this function.

The writings of J. Lloyd Trump were vastly influential in focusing attention on changes in the library's function, and in spelling out the form these changes were to take.⁹ The school organization envisioned by Trump was intended to foster the discovery approach and to provide for individual differences while making more effective use of staff and resources.

Trump's scheme required some rather dramatic changes in school organization. A departure from rigid compartmentalization of classrooms and periods meant flexible

⁹J. Lloyd Trump, Guide to Better Schools (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1961).

scheduling and grouping. Large and small group instruction and independent study would be used for varying purposes. Trump suggested the following allocations of time: 40 per cent for large group instruction, 40 per cent for independent study, and 20 per cent for small group instruction. Team teaching techniques would make most efficient use of professional time and skills.

In order to implement this plan the school would have to provide the physical spaces and facilities for these types of instruction or study. The auditorium would provide for large group instruction, but the library and subject laboratories were seen to fulfill the needs involved in small group instruction and independent study. It would have conference rooms in close proximity which would also serve as small group listening and viewing areas. Electronically wired study carrels would provide each student with the opportunity to pursue his own investigation on his own level, at his own rate, and through his own choice of medium.

The Trump plan has been widely implemented with varying modifications and emphases. Team teaching, flexible grouping, and libraries which have many of the attributes described by Trump have recently become commonplace.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

Educational and curriculum thought established a theoretical base, and Trump's organizational scheme suggested the form for a new type of school library. Certain factors and events have hastened the actualization of the plan in both the United States and Canada.

The American Library Association has published three sets of standards which have greatly facilitated library development. School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow; Functions and Standards, published in 1945, established the first quantitative and qualitative standards for school libraries.¹⁰ In 1960 the publication, Standards for School Library Programs, established new minimum standards.¹¹ In 1969 the American Library Association again updated their standards through the publication, Standards for School Media Programs.¹² These works enhanced progress in library development by providing a goal towards which those people concerned with school libraries might strive.

¹⁰American Library Association, School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow; Functions and Standards (Chicago: American Library Association, 1945).

¹¹American Association of School Librarians, Standards for School Library Programs (Chicago: American Library Association, 1960).

¹²American Association of School Librarians and the Department of Audiovisual Instruction, National Education Association, Standards for School Media Programs (Chicago: American Library Association, 1969).

The Knapp School Library Project set up demonstration libraries which promoted library development.¹³ A set of Canadian standards set forth guidelines which fostered library development in Canada.¹⁴

Growth of school libraries in Canada, though lacking the federal financial backing which has spurred progress in the United States, has nevertheless proceeded at a rapid and accelerating rate. In Alberta, the number of centralized libraries increased from fifty to more than seven hundred, and the number of full-time librarians from nine to nearly three hundred between 1959 and 1969.¹⁵

The milieu in which the librarian operates and the purposes towards which he strives have undergone phenomenal change in the recent past; it follows then that the role of the librarian must change concomitantly. It is his responsibility to apply the theory and utilize the facilities so that the library may become a force for educational excellence and individual actualization. Goodlad comments in this connection, "It becomes obvious that the difference

¹³American Association of School Librarians, Realization: The Final Report of the Knapp School Library Project (Chicago: American Library Association, 1968)

¹⁴Canadian School Library Association, Standards of Library Service for Canadian Schools (Toronto: Ryerson, Press, 1967).

¹⁵Blanche Friderichsen, "School Libraries in Alberta," Alberta School Library Review, 6:5-8, Fall 1969.

between the library as storehouse and the library as educational force is the librarian".¹⁶

Only limited direction, however, is provided to the librarian in the performance of his role. The American Standards have broadly outlined the functions to be fulfilled by the librarian.¹⁷ The Canadian Standards have likewise roughly categorized activities to be undertaken.¹⁸ These lists are in no way mandatory, however, and teachers and administrators may not know or accept their tenets. Though the librarian may be familiar with the general principles, he may find that the different perceptions of his role which are held by teachers and administrators inhibit or prevent him from fulfilling that role in the desired manner. From among the multiplicity of tasks confronting the librarian, no priorities are set for him. Lack of clerical help often adds non-professional duties to the array from which he must choose.

Lacking a clear role definition, the librarian undertakes his duties on a haphazard basis of priority. His tasks at any given time are a compromise between the divergent views of professional librarians, teachers, and principals.

¹⁶ National Education Association of the United States, Project on the Instructional Program of the Public Schools, Planning and Organizing for Teaching (Washington: National Education Association of the United States, 1963), p. 126.

¹⁷ American Association of School Librarians, Standards . . . op. cit., pp. 47-50.

¹⁸ Canadian School Library Association, op. cit., p. 22.

The compromise is subject to criticism and the librarian experiences role conflict. Research is needed which will clarify the role of the librarian in the modern school library setting. Clear delineation of tasks and establishment of priorities by school boards would eliminate some of the actual and potential conflicts in expectations.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

In order to determine librarians', principals' and teachers' perceptions of the school librarian's role as well as the actual performance of that role, an instrument consisting of fifty-five tasks was constructed. These tasks, derived from the related literature and broken into four areas of possible librarian performance, were judged by a panel of experts as to clarity and appropriateness. The whole questionnaire was also judged for comprehensiveness. Respondents included in the study were randomly selected from those Alberta schools employing full-time librarians.

The data collected by the questionnaire were analyzed to compare the ideal perceptions of the tasks held by the various respondent groups. Actual practice in respect to these tasks, as reported by the librarians, was also compared to the ideal perceptions of the three groups. Through these two sets of comparisons, areas in which role conflict existed were revealed.

HYPOTHESES TESTED

The following six hypotheses served as the basis for the design of the study, the collection and analysis of data, and the presentation of results.

1. Librarians and principals view similarly the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory.

2. Librarians and teachers view similarly the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory.

3. Principals and teachers view similarly the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory.

4. The opinions which the librarian holds regarding the degree to which his possible tasks should be mandatory and the degree to which he actually performs them are similar.

5. Principals' opinions regarding the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory and the degree to which they are actually performed are similar.

6. Teachers' opinions regarding the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory and the degree to which they are actually performed are similar.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. The sample for this study was drawn from Alberta schools in which full time librarians are employed.
2. The views of only two referent groups, principals and teachers, were considered in this study.
3. In determining the areas in which differences of opinion exist, the study focused on the duties of the librarian.
4. The study was limited to three task areas of librarian performance, administrative, educational and technical. It also included a fourth category of non-professional tasks.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Role - a set of expectations applied to the incumbent of a particular position.

Expectation - an evaluative standard applied to the incumbent of a particular position.

Referent groups - groups who are in a counter position to the focal member and have a right to define the role of that member.

Librarian - the person designated by the school board to organize and administer the school library and library program.

Reading guidance - systematic assistance to the reader in finding enjoyable, understandable books and other materials to meet a variety of purposes for reading.

Reference services - assisting children and teachers to locate materials and to find needed information.

Instruction in library skills - teaching students to use the library and its resources effectively.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

A shortcoming common to all questionnaires of this type must be considered in relation to the instrument for this study. The wording of the items may not coincide precisely with the way in which the respondent's ideas are mentally organized and therefore may not be interpreted exactly as they were meant. If there is a great difference between the frame of reference of the instrument and that of the individual, the participant will be unable to express his views accurately.

The five-point scale on which respondents register the degree of obligation which they attach to each task has certain advantages over other possible methods. Tasks are sometimes ranked on a continuum of "least important" to "most important" or rank ordered according to their degree of importance in relation to one another. However, neither of these systems allows the respondent to cast a negative vote. The scale used in the instrument of the present study

permits a negative vote but has a narrower range of positive comparisons than do the aforementioned methods.

The measure of the actual performance of the tasks in the schools was based on information reported by the librarians themselves. This method of obtaining information places some limitations upon the comparison of actual practice with the views expressed by the three groups.

A further limitation of the study may lie in the fact that respondents could sense a relationship between the tasks which might influence their responses.

PLAN OF THE STUDY

Chapter II provides a brief examination of role theory and a review of the research and theoretical writings related to the role of the school librarian.

Chapter III describes the design of the study. It explains the instrument, the collection of data and the statistical procedures used in analyzing the data and in testing the hypotheses.

Chapter IV is devoted to an analysis of the data to test the hypotheses relating to the tasks of the school librarian.

Chapter V draws conclusions from the findings, discusses the implications of the study and makes recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides background for the study in terms of basic role theory and of the research and theoretical writings relating to the school librarian's role.

ROLE THEORY

A brief consideration of some of the significant literature relating to the role concept has been included inasmuch as role theory forms the basis for this study.

The term and concept "role", as it is used today became commonplace in the nineteen forties. Linton, an anthropologist, was instrumental in popularizing the term.¹ According to Linton, individuals in society occupy various positions, each accompanied by specific rights and duties. In the process of performing in a position an individual assumes a role representing those aspects of the position which can be learned and performed. Since behavior is a function of the position occupied by a person, marked variations in behavior in one individual may be explained as a result of contradictory roles, while differences in

¹Ralph Linton, The Study of Man (New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1936), p. 14.

behavior among individuals may be understood in terms of differences in their roles.

Sociologists have characteristically defined role in terms of behavior of individuals within a group, institution or society. Homans describes role as a group norm which determines the relationship expected of an incumbent of a specific position to other position incumbents with whom he comes in contact.² Gross, Mason and McEachern, in a landmark role study of the school superintendent, define role as a "set of evaluative standards applied to the incumbent of a particular position".³

Psychologists have been concerned with role in respect to the individual's personal adjustment to society. Argyle explains role thus:

Since an individual occupies a number of positions . . . and since situations vary in the extent to which each position is relevant to them and structures them, the personality sometimes appears to change dramatically as the individual moves from the territory of one position to another.⁴

Getzels and Guba have constructed a model which

²George C. Homans, The Human Group (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1950).

³Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1958), p. 60.

⁴Michael Argyle, "The Concepts of Role and Status," Readings in General Psychology, Paul Holmes and Alan Iliffe (Ed.) (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959), p. 154.

incorporates both viewpoints.⁵ Their model examines two dimensions of behavior: the nomothetic, which is concerned with roles and expectations within an institution, and the ideographic, which is concerned with the individual, his needs and personal adjustment. They see the social system as involving two classes of phenomena which are interactive but conceptually independent. There is the institution with certain roles and expectations, and there are individuals who have certain personalities and need dispositions. If the expectations of the system and the individual coincide, effective and efficient enactment of the duties of the position will result. This situation, however, is idealistic and rarely occurs. Role conflict occurs when: (1) the institutional expectations for the behavior of an individual are incompatible with his need disposition, (2) an individual occupies two or more positions for which expectations are incompatible, and (3) disagreement exists among the referent groups who have a right to define expectations for a position.

When roles are defined in terms of institutional expectations, the rights and duties which are suggested by these expectations define, to a degree, what a role incumbent should or should not do under various circumstance. The expectations of the various referent groups should be known

⁵J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," The School Review, 65:423-41, 1957.

by the incumbent of a position in order for him to minimize role conflict either by adjusting his behavior or by influencing those expectations. Ralph W. Tyler has expressed this need thus:

The usefulness of this analysis of role perceptions and their congruity has become widely recognized among social scientists. In many cases, the effectiveness of a professional person is related to the way in which he perceives his role and the similarity between his perception and the way in which the public perceives his role.⁶

The task expectations held for the school librarian by teachers, principals and by other librarians must be known by the librarian in order for him to perform his duties more effectively and efficiently.

LITERATURE RELATING TO THE SCHOOL LIBRARIAN'S ROLE

A survey of the literature pertaining to the role of the school librarian revealed a dearth of research, although numerous theoretical discussions of the role and function were to be found in the writings of authorities in the field. Research in this area has in large part been initiated and sponsored by the American Library Association; therefore little individually conducted research is to be found. Regarding this situation Swarthout comments:

. . . While Goodlad, an educator, has written most pointedly about the "concept of the library as a

⁶Ralph W. Tyler, "The School Librarian's Boss," In The Climate of Book Selection - Social Influence on School and Public Libraries (Berkeley, California: University of California School of Librarianship, 1959), p. 35.

part of the instructional system", a search of recent doctoral dissertations in education reveals no study that concerns itself with such a concept. However, writings about libraries have traditionally been under the auspices of the American Library Association, and educators' references are oblique or non-existent.⁷

This study examined the research which relates to the school librarian's role, and the theory which emerges regarding that role from selected writings in the field of school libraries.

Research

A literature search revealed only one study which partially parallels the present one. This investigation was conducted by Lowell Ellis Olson at the University of Minnesota in 1966.⁸ A questionnaire eliciting responses regarding the librarian's status, preparation and duties, and the objectives of library service was submitted to a random sample of librarians, teachers and principals in Minnesota. Significance of differences was tested to determine the difference in general patterning of the participants' perceptions of the librarian's role.

The findings of this study indicate that teachers, principals and librarians differ significantly in their perceptions of the school librarian's status, preparation

⁷Charles R. Swarthout, The School Library as Part of the Instructional System (Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press Inc., 1967), p. 16.

⁸Lowell Ellis Olson, "Teachers', Principals', and Librarians' Perceptions of the School Librarian's Role" (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Minnesota, 1966).

and functions, and in the stress they would place on those functions. Roughly half of the respondents felt the position to be similar to that of a teacher and were aware that librarians are certified teachers. All groups thought that technical processing received most attention but that administration should have greatest stress. Less than half of the respondents felt that librarians should not perform clerical tasks. In ranking student-related activities all groups gave priority to providing materials and services, and least stress to developing desirable social attitudes. Regarding teacher and community related activities all groups gave most emphasis to services which promote the school's objectives, and least stress to developing a community library program.

Respondents' perceptions of the librarian's functions bore no significant relationship to variables in their own backgrounds. Some relationship was revealed between participants' positions and their perceptions of the librarian's role, but few factors influencing such perceptions were identified. As a result of the study Olson recommends that librarians include teachers and principals in library planning, and inform these groups regarding their role.

Olson included seventy activities in his instrument but used composite scores grouped into five function categories for his analysis. The design did not permit a rank order comparison of the activities by the three respondent groups, nor did it permit a comparison of the importance of

individual activities as seen by the three groups.

A study by Gaver and Jones which investigated school library services has a direct bearing on the role of the librarian inasmuch as services may be viewed in terms of tasks for library personnel.⁹ This investigation undertook to identify and define school library services, to ascertain which services were performed in two sample groups, and to determine the opinions of a selected group of school library experts as to which services are most important. The study was concerned only with educational aspects of library service such as reading guidance, instruction in library skills, and personal and social guidance, and disregarded organizational and technical services.

A basic list of 110 services was developed and incorporated into a questionnaire designed to elicit responses as to whether or not such a service was provided in a given school and which services were considered most important by the experts. For the purpose of determining whether the service was provided, the questionnaire was administered to two sample populations, one whose libraries were rated superior by state library supervisors, and another representing a cross-section of metropolitan schools in

⁹Mary V. Gaver and Milbrey L. Jones, "Secondary Library Services: A Search for Essentials," Teachers' College Record, 18: 200-9, December, 1966.

New Jersey. To obtain expert opinion on the importance of the services, the list was submitted to a group of persons considered expert in the field of school libraries.

The data for this study were not subjected to rigorous statistical analysis. Percentages were computed of experts considering a service important, and of schools in the two samples providing the service. However, from their analysis Gaver and Jones reach the following conclusions:

1. More of the services were provided by the "superior" group than by the cross-section; those services involving least expense and time were provided most frequently by both groups; the services offered appeared to be proportional to the amount of non-professional help available.

2. A high degree of agreement was evidenced between the experts and school librarians regarding the importance of the various tasks, both groups favoring activities involving a group approach over more expensive and time consuming individual techniques.

The authors infer that certain services considered important by the experts are not offered because of lack of time and staff; they therefore recommend that librarians abandon efforts at individual work with students, and rely heavily on group techniques.

A second study conducted by Gaver in 1969 involved two samples, similar to those used in the first study, which

represented average and superior service.¹⁰ A new checklist of 274 services, expanded to include media services, was used along with an interview procedure.

The percentage of the total number of services offered by each school was compiled. Roughly thirty-five percent of the services were offered by the average sample, while fifty-four percent were offered by the superior sample. These figures were in contrast to forty-seven and sixty-three percent respectively reported in the 1965 study, although the latter were based on a shorter checklist. The number of services offered by the two groups differed at both times, and was considerably lower in 1969 than in 1965.

According to Gaver, the second study indicates a lack of consensus regarding important services and a disparity in the services offered by the two groups. She also reports a positive relationship between the number of services provided and (1) the number of paid staff, and (2) the ratio of paid staff to students. However, the method of analysis which was used to arrive at this correlation is not described in this report of the study. The services which Gaver found to receive greatest emphasis involved (1) instruction and supervision of students, and (2) inservice education and direct service to teachers.

¹⁰Mary Virginia Gaver, "Services in Secondary School Media Centers: A Second Appraisal," School Libraries, 20:15-21, Fall, 1970.

Neither of the Gaver studies related the expectations of librarians to those of teachers or principals, nor did they examine the importance of the tasks in the opinions of these groups.

Walker conducted a study designed to measure the attitudes of teachers and librarians regarding the role of the librarian and the objectives of good library service.¹¹ The population for his study was composed of librarians and selected teachers from two schools chosen as demonstration centres for the Knapp School Library Project. A questionnaire consisting of statements about what a librarian should do was administered to 133 participants.

The statistical design for this study was not rigorous in that it permitted only a bi-polar response to each item. No provision was made whereby respondents could register degrees of agreement. Furthermore, the fact that his population was drawn from schools in which an experimental program was in progress precludes generalization to the whole population.

Walker found the highest degree of agreement among teachers and librarians with the following concepts:

1. Librarians are part of the instructional staff; they should provide reading guidance, instruction in library skills, and reference services.

¹¹Jerry L. Walker, "Changing Attitudes Toward the Library and the Librarian," American Library Association Bulletin, 61:977-81, September 1967.

2. Many teachers do not use the library effectively; therefore librarians should provide in-service training for teachers, arrange for help in audio-visual materials preparation, and involve teachers in the selection of books and materials.

Walker's analysis of the responses lead him to the following inferences:

1. Though a redefinition of the librarian's role is still in the making, an acceptance is reflected not only of his traditional role as instructor in library skills and materials specialist, but also of his emerging role as an active participant in the instructional program of the school.

2. There is a recognized need for measures which will help teachers become more knowledgeable about and more active participants in the school's library program.

The design of the Walker study did not permit analysis of the data to determine the extent of agreement or disagreement which existed with the statements. Therefore the extent to which role conflict occurred could not be determined.

Warner investigated the role of the librarian as a co-worker in guidance from the viewpoint of the guidance counsellor.¹² He attempted to ascertain from guidance

¹²John Ellsworth Warner, "The Role of the Librarian as a Co-worker in Guidance from the Viewpoint of the Guidance Worker" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University 1963), Dissertation Abstracts, 24:2047, 1963.

workers the contributions which they believed librarians make to educational, vocational, personal and social guidance. A questionnaire to elicit judgments regarding the librarian's effectiveness as a co-worker in guidance was submitted to guidance workers in selected schools in each region of the United States. From the data received the author formulated an evaluative summary of the role of the librarian as a support worker in guidance. He concluded that much re-education and re-organization is necessary in order for the librarian to become an effective support worker in guidance.

The relevance of this study is limited in that it is concerned with only one aspect of the librarian's role, that of providing guidance, and disregards the instructional, administrative and technical functions. Furthermore it examines the role from the viewpoint of guidance workers only, giving no consideration to the perceptions of other referent groups.

Phase I of the School Library Manpower Project, administered by the American Association of School Librarians and funded by the Knapp Foundation, undertook a task analysis of school library positions as part of a program designed to foster a new approach to education for school librarianship.¹³ A task analysis survey instrument was developed to

¹³Research Division, National Education Association, School Library Personnel Task Analysis Survey (Chicago: American Library Association, 1969).

identify the tasks performed by school libraries and the types of personnel performing each task. The population for the study was not based on a sample but represented the universe of the best school library media centres in the United States. A set of evaluative criteria designated "Criteria for Excellence" was employed to identify those schools with superior library programs in unified library media centres. This list made certain specifications which had to be met regarding staff (at least two trained librarians and/or audio-visual specialists), variety in materials and media, physical design and facilities, library programs, and services to teachers.

The task analysis survey instrument included a three hundred item checklist of tasks based on a search of the literature and the opinions of experts. The checklist identified the staff members who performed each of the tasks, which were grouped into twelve categories. Eight staff positions were used, five of these being paid media personnel, two unpaid, and one a non-media school staff member.

Analysis of the data revealed that heads of library media centres most frequently identified administration as their primary responsibility, with secondary emphasis on general services (all phases of library media centre work). Assistant librarians indicated general services as comprising their major responsibility. Of secondary importance were services to teachers and students in the case of elementary

schools, while cataloguing and subject specialty work were deemed of second and third importance in secondary schools. Paid adult clerks or aides were responsible for circulation, and clerical as well as general services.

The task analysis survey was intended to develop job descriptions of various positions in order to assess their implications regarding training and certification for these positions. Since the population for the study represents superior library service, the librarian's role in average or below average libraries is not defined. This study bears a relationship to the present one in that it analyses the tasks performed by library personnel. However, the data from the sample were analysed for the purpose of developing programs in school librarianship rather than determining role relationships and role conflict.

Nordin conducted a study in 1968 which endeavoured to determine the attitudes of senior high school teachers in Alberta regarding the role and function of the library.¹⁴ The population for the study consisted of 154 teachers and eight librarians in eight senior high schools in central Alberta. Although this study did not directly investigate the role of the librarian, some of the findings relate to teachers' perceptions of that role.

¹⁴Adelaide Louise Nordin, "Teachers' Attitudes Towards the School Library" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1968).

Approximately 60 percent of teachers felt that librarians should have department head status. Over three-fourths of the respondents expressed the opinion that librarians should be included in curriculum committee meetings. More than two-thirds of the participants agreed that the librarian should be a member of teaching teams. There was general agreement (94 percent) that librarians should be consulted regarding assignments. More than 93 percent of teachers indicated a belief that library and classroom work should be integrated. Agreement was also high (85 percent) with a statement that librarians should provide teachers with information regarding students.

The instrument for this study permitted respondents to attribute to each item a particular degree of importance on a four point scale. In the analysis of data percentages of respondents in each category were compiled. The study did not ascertain whether or not statistically significant differences in attitude existed among groups of respondents. The attitudes of only one referent group were considered, and areas of role conflict were not examined.

A survey of library services in the Prince George District of British Columbia was conducted by Wright and Wiedrick in 1969.¹⁵ Some of the findings of this survey

¹⁵John G. Wright and L. G. Wiedrick, "Survey of School Library Services in Prince George School District No. 57" (Mimeographed.)

concern the administrative responsibilities of the school librarian and are therefore relevant to the present study.

All librarians and principals and a random sample of teachers in those schools which had a centralized library and a full time librarian completed a questionnaire designed to evaluate library administration. Respondents indicated whether they considered certain specified services satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

A high percentage of librarians, principals and teachers (90 percent, 80 percent and 85 percent respectively) registered satisfaction with the professional reading and reference services provided to students and teachers. In regard to bibliographical work, a high percentage of all groups (librarians - 70 percent, principals - 75 percent, teachers - 82 percent) were satisfied with the librarian's provision of lists of resource materials.

Regarding the librarian's work with teachers, 75 percent of teachers, 65 percent of principals and 55 percent of librarians found the librarian's work in helping to plan assignments to be satisfactory. However, only 15 percent of librarians as compared to 85 percent of principals and 73 percent of teachers felt that the librarian's work with teachers in providing instruction in library use was satisfactory. A low percentage of all groups (librarians - 25 percent, principals - 30 percent, teachers - 24 percent) indicated satisfaction with the librarian's part

in curriculum planning. A similarly low proportion of all groups (librarians - 25 percent, principals - 25 percent, teachers - 33 percent) professed satisfaction with the school's library policy statement. However, a slightly higher percentage of librarians, principals and teachers (45 percent, 40 percent, and 67 percent respectively) were satisfied with the librarian's work with the staff in forming a library policy statement and library program.

In respect to administrative library services in general the authors conclude that librarians and principals see a greater need for improvement than do teachers.

This survey allowed respondents to record satisfaction or dissatisfaction with existing library services, and ascertained whether or not, in the opinions of the three groups, certain services were provided. However, it did not elicit expectations regarding the tasks or make comparisons among groups.

Theoretical Writings

Writings other than research which relate to the role of the school librarian were surveyed in order to determine recent and current patterns of thought and emphasis.

Standards for School Library Programs, published by the American Association of School Librarians in 1960, established broad guidelines for all aspects of school library service including the role of the librarian.¹⁶ It may be

¹⁶American Association of School Librarians, Standard . . . op cit., pp. 47-50.

considered to represent the official position of authorities in the field of school libraries regarding minimum goals towards which all school libraries in the United States should aim.

The following general areas are designated as the responsibility of the professional library staff:

1. Co-operating with all staff members in promoting effective use of the library.
2. Providing reading, listening and viewing guidance for students.
3. Evaluating, selecting and organizing materials and offering guidance in their use.
4. Serving as materials resource person on curriculum committees.
5. Serving on committees to evaluate textbooks and recommending library materials to supplement them.
6. Participating in co-curricular activities of the school.
7. Assuming responsibility, if designated head librarian in a larger school, for the following: (a) designing and implementing the library program, (b) directing organizational and technical function, (c) serving on school policy-making bodies, (d) working co-operatively with the audio-visual unit if this is separate, (e) co-ordinating the school's services with those of the public library, (f) helping to formulate a policy statement, (g) holding book and materials selection conferences with all staff members.

The updated standards, Standards for School Media Programs, published in 1969, uses the terms media centre and media specialist rather than library and librarian.¹⁷ The functions enumerated are substantially the same, with the additional delineation of the following:

1. Assisting teachers, students and technicians to produce materials.

2. Assisting students to gain skill in techniques of study, inquiry and critical evaluation.

3. Providing pertinent information to teachers regarding pupils.

4. Serving on teaching teams, acting as a resource person in the classroom, and helping teachers to plan instructional experiences.

5. Providing information to the faculty on current developments in education and in the various subject fields.

Standards of Library Service for Canadian Schools, prepared under the auspices of the Canadian School Library Association and published in 1967, establishes guidelines in library service for the Canadian scene.¹⁸ The role of the librarian is broadly outlined in this work. Functions are

¹⁷American Association of School Librarians and the Department of Audiovisual Instruction, National Education Association, Standards for School Media Programs (Chicago: American Library Association, 1969). pp. 7-12.

¹⁸Canadian School Library Association, Standards of Library Service for Canadian Schools (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1967). p. 22.

grouped into the following categories:

1. Building and organizing the materials collection.
2. Assisting staff members to utilize materials
(This includes instruction in library skills, reference services, reading guidance and compilation of bibliographies).
3. Training and directing clerical and student assistants.
4. Publicizing and selling the library program.

Lucille Fargo was one of the earlier authors to outline the functions of school librarians. Since her book The Library in the School was published in 1947 certain aspects of the role now considered vital were ignored.¹⁹ However, those tasks listed may still be considered valid though they no longer comprise the total role. Fargo groups the duties into four categories:

1. Administrative
2. Technical
3. Educational and guidance
4. Public Relations

The administrative function is comprised of such duties as arranging schedules, determining policies and routines, acquisition, budgeting, and overseeing processing. Technical duties include classifying and cataloguing books and materials and may include organizing audiovisual aids.

¹⁹ Lucille Fargo, The Library in the School, (Chicago: American Library Association, 1947). pp. 111-117.

Educational and guidance duties include reading guidance, reference work, instruction in library use, curriculum enrichment work with teachers, and work with clubs and committees. Public relations duties consist of working co-operatively with students and teachers, and publicizing the library. Fargo distinguishes between the above professional tasks and routine tasks such as charging books, checking attendance, checking periodicals and typing book cards. She emphasizes that these tasks should be performed not by the librarian but by clerical or non-professional assistants.

Gardiner asserts that the primary functions of the school librarian are the organization of the book collection and services to pupils and teachers.²⁰ The librarian is seen to share with other school personnel the responsibility of seeing that the library functions as an integral part of the school. Gardiner believes that this integration is to be achieved through providing a well-rounded collection to meet curricular and recreational needs and through creating a climate conducive to extensive use of the library.

Ellsworth stresses the importance of the role of the school librarian thus: "Without the right kind of librarian, a school library seldom becomes more than a glorified

²⁰Jewel Gardiner, Administering Library Service in the Elementary School (Chicago: American Library Association, 1954), pp. 31-32.

study-hall".²¹ He categorizes the functions of the librarian as: (1) selection and organization of materials, (2) supervising library staff activities, (3) reference work, i.e. helping or teaching students to locate information, (4) working with teachers in selecting and assembling materials, (5) preparation of special materials such as reading lists, bibliographies, news bulletins, displays, (6) other duties such as working with administrators, counsellors, and other library agencies.²²

Swarthout discusses the interrelationships between the role of the librarian, the expectations of teachers and the effectiveness of the library program in promoting instructional goals.²³ She contends that many teachers, through lack of understanding of the library's function, regard the librarian as a clerical rather than a supporting professional, and therefore fail to make demands upon him which are consistent with his professional role and thus to gain maximum benefit from the library. She states:

. . . At the outset the librarian's knowledge of curriculum areas and resource materials should be expected to play a key function in the faculty planning to promote educational goals. When acceptance of the librarian's role exists, it may be expected that classroom teachers are knowledgeable about libraries and library skills. This expectation would include an acceptance of the value of library

²¹Ralph E. Ellsworth, The School Library (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education Inc., 1965), p. 35.

²²Ibid., pp. 36-41.

²³Swarthout, op. cit.

skills, an understanding of library skills, and a commitment to the use of many types of materials and a variety of methods.²⁴

Swarthout also asserts that one of the special contributions which the librarian brings to the educational program is the selection and organization of resources that promote the learning process of the school. In support of the discovery approach to learning the author sees arrangements for inquiry and a responsive environment as particular concerns of the librarian.

Saunders posits that work with students and faculty is the most important aspect of the librarian's role. She states:

. . . Selection, cataloging, compiling, bibliographies, and many other tasks are important jobs which directly affect the library program, and time must be given to them by all members of the staff. All of these services, however, are a means toward guiding teachers and students in the best use of the library. Therefore most of the librarian's time should be spent with teachers and students.

. . . School librarians must stop doing clerical tasks and other jobs which should be done by sub-professional personnel.²⁵

Delaney comments that some confusion exists about the role of the librarian and that the daily tasks of one librarian may differ quite markedly from those of another.²⁶ He suggests that a summary derived from lists compiled by many

²⁴Ibid., p. 98.

²⁵Helen E. Saunders, The Modern School Library: Its Administration as a Materials Center (Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press Inc., 1968), p. 150.

²⁶Jack D. Delaney, The New School Librarian (Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String Press, 1968), pp. 3-5.

librarians would include: selecting materials, informing staff of acquisitions, preparing bibliographies, finding information for students and teachers, teaching the use of the library, supervising the work of assistants, making schedules, and keeping records.

Davies discusses at length the role of the school librarian in providing a quality school library program which is an instrument for educational excellence.²⁷ She states:

. . . The status of the librarian has changed from studyhall monitor and book curator to team teacher, learning expiditer and media program engineer. Today's school librarian extends the library's resources beyond traditional printed materials to all sorts and kinds of media essential to the developmental needs of the curriculum and to the personal needs of students. The major function of today's school librarian is to join the resources for thinking into a pattern of purposeful, intelligent and profitable usage.²⁸

Davies sees the librarian's role as having several facets. The librarian acts variously as: (1) a mediating agent for educational excellence who integrates library services with the educational program, (2) a curriculum consultant who participates in curriculum committee, grade level and department meetings, (3) a materials specialist who selects, acquires and makes accessible a functional collection of instructional media which support the teaching program. Davies also provides a job description for the

²⁷ Ruth Ann Davies, The School Library, A Force for Educational Excellence (New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1969)

²⁸ Ibid., p. 24.

role of the school librarian. She lists thirty-four major functions of school librarians and categorizes them as administrative, educational or technical functions.

Alexander, in an article on the librarian's multimedia role, emphasizes the part the librarian can play in helping children to achieve independence in learning.²⁹ He must acquaint students with the various resources of the library; he must teach them how to use each resource; he must teach them to select from among the media that which will be most effective for each learning situation.

Melnick states that the librarian can become "the hub around which the educational program of the school flows".³⁰ She sees the librarian performing in the following ways: (1) as a catalyst, bringing books and children together, (2) as a materials consultant to teachers, curriculum committees and students who plans with teachers for the selection and use of appropriate materials and their integration into study units, (3) as a teacher and storyteller who teaches library skills and brings beautiful stories to life to cultivate an awareness of the library. Melnick envisions greater specialization and more extensive use of the team approach in the libraries of the future as growth and

²⁹Elenora Alexander, "The Librarian's Multimedia Role," The Instructor, 7:55-6, November, 1964.

³⁰Valerie Melnick, "The Librarian's Role," Theory into Practice, 6:40-3, February, 1967.

development continue to change the concept of the library.

Frazier describes new tasks for librarians arising from new trends in instruction.³¹ Three major trends cited are greater use of technology and the resources for learning, greater independence in study and learning, and greater freedom from grade level restrictions. The new responsibilities evolving from these trends are: (1) providing for a greater flow and variety of materials which are relevant to new teaching needs, (2) teaching the use of materials in closer relationship to classroom purposes, (3) guiding and teaching students to find the information and ideas they want, to derive what they want from them, to organize them and to share them effectively with others.

Manderson describes the role of the school librarian at the elementary level.³² She sees the librarian variously as teacher, administrator, public relations person, media specialist and library clerk. As an administrator the librarian selects and orders books and materials, arranges workshops and in-service training for teachers, and trains assistants. As a teacher he instructs students in the use of books and the library, gives book talks, prepares displays,

³¹Alexander Frazier, "New Trends in Instruction - New Tasks for School Librarians," School Libraries, 12:13-6, January, 1963.

³²Francis Manderson, "The Role of the School Librarian," New Jersey Libraries, 2:41-2, Summer, 1969.

and serves on curriculum committees. As a media specialist he selects, orders and organizes all kinds of non-print materials and the media for their use.

Cannon describes the role of the secondary school librarian.³³ The functions which she lists include: (1) making teachers aware of the library resources, (2) helping them to plan lessons which will make optimum use of these materials, (3) integrating library skills into the curriculum, (4) providing special student services such as book talks, reading lists, and talks by local authors.

W. A. T. Perrins expresses the belief that the librarian should have charge of audio-visual materials and media in order to provide central cataloguing so that students may use these materials in independent study and at a time when there is a felt need.³⁴ He suggests that an increasing amount of the librarian's time should be spent on directing research, and that librarians should photostat materials required by students. He feels that interesting the slow learner through book talks, the use of varied media, and special materials selection is a particular concern of the librarian. Other responsibilities which Perrins cites are selling the library program, providing specifications for library design and dispensing the library budget.

³³Marion Cannon, "Role of Secondary School Librarians," New Jersey Libraries, 2:43-44, Summer, 1969.

³⁴W. A. T. Perrins, "The Changing Role of the School Librarian," Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation Bulletin, 46:77-8, March, 1969.

Betty Fast stresses the importance of teacher-librarian co-operation in pre-planning units to assure maximum use of appropriate materials and to integrate the teaching of library skills with classroom work.³⁵

The librarian's role in the literature program is outlined by McGuire.³⁶ The author emphasizes the value of group literature-sharing experiences as well as the individual guidance involved in helping to select the right book for the needs and interests of the child. The literature-sharing may take the form of discussions or presentations by librarians on special subjects, literary forms or new books. The librarian may work with small groups in special enrichment or motivational experiences. McGuire also stresses the importance of high teacher expectations regarding the role of the librarian if the library is to function effectively.

SUMMARY

A review of the literature indicates a paucity of research relating to the role of the school librarian. The research which has been conducted has examined different aspects of the role for different purposes. However, it has not attempted to identify those tasks for which

³⁵Betty Fast, "Teachers and Librarians: Stage Managers for the Learning Program, Childhood Education, 43:73-5, October, 1966.

³⁶Alice Brooks McGuire, "The Librarian's Role in the Literature Program," Elementary English, 44:468-71, May, 1967.

conflicting expectations exist between the librarian and his referent groups. Nor have the theoretical writings cast must light on such conflicting expectations if they exist. The present study attempts to determine the degree of similarity of expectations between the librarian and his referent groups.

Guidelines Drawn From the Literature

Certain guidelines and cautions which were observed in this study were suggested by the research reviewed.

1. The sample used in many of the studies reported was either geographically limited or was drawn from superior or experimental schools. The sample for this study was randomly drawn from all the Alberta schools where a full-time librarian's services were provided.

2. The studies reviewed concentrated on the school librarian's role either in elementary or secondary schools. The present study undertook to assess this role in more general terms by disregarding grade level.

3. Of the studies reported, several investigated the school library services currently offered, while some investigated services which participants deemed desirable. However, none of these studies undertook a comparison of ideal and actual library services. The present study therefore undertook to investigate both current practice and the ideal perceptions of respondents, and to compare the two.

4. The fact that many of the studies reported their findings simply in the form of percentages suggested a need

for the more rigorous statistical analysis which was employed in the present study.

5. The use of a five-point Likert scale in the instrument was deemed advisable in the light of the fact that the instruments used in many studies had only two or three response categories.

6. The fact that some studies did not obtain a high percentage of responses suggested the procedure of securing the initial co-operation of superintendents and principals in order to obtain a high response ratio.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

A review of the research which has been conducted on the role of the school librarian has revealed a small number of studies related to some aspect of that role. However, no study was found which was specifically concerned with comparing the expectations held by the librarian and his primary referent groups regarding his various duties. Nor has any study reviewed ascertained the tasks for which conflicting expectations exist or for which expectations differ from current practice. The theoretical writings have been mainly concerned with the services which the school library should offer and which the school librarian should provide.

The success which a librarian achieves in the performance of his duties may be determined, in part, by the emphasis which he accords to the various functions. In deciding whether or not to perform certain tasks and in determining their relative importance he is influenced by his perceptions of the expectations of his referent groups.

Briefly, the purpose of the present study was (1) to determine the extent of agreement existing among librarians, principals and teachers regarding the degree to which certain librarian's tasks should be mandatory, and

(2) to determine the extent to which the expectations of these groups differ from current practice.

The six null hypotheses were tested to ascertain whether or not significant differences existed at the .01 level of confidence.

SELECTION OF RESPONDENTS

Samples of each of the referent groups of the school librarian were considered in this study. Respondents were randomly selected from all public and private schools in Alberta, regardless of grade level, where full-time librarians were employed.

The School Librarian Sample

An alphabetical list of all the full-time librarians in Alberta was constructed from information obtained from the files of the Provincial School Library Consultant. From this list of 288 librarians, sixty were randomly selected for participation in this study.

The Principal Sample

The sample of sixty school principals was comprised of all those principals of the schools in which the randomly selected librarians were located.

The Teacher Sample

A random sample of 160 teachers was selected from those schools chosen on the basis of the librarian sample. Since this number represented ten percent of the total

number of teachers in all the schools, one in every ten teachers was selected from each school to constitute the teacher sample.

THE INSTRUMENT

A two-part questionnaire, from which the data for this study were obtained, was designed specifically for this study. Section A elicited information about respondents with respect to grade level taught or served, subject speciality, years of professional education, and library courses taken. Only teachers and librarians were asked to complete Section A.

Section B of the questionnaire contained fifty-five statements of possible duties of the school librarian derived from the research and theoretical writings. The task items were chosen from three categories of professional librarian performance - administrative, educational and technical - and from a fourth category of non-professional tasks.

This section of the questionnaire permitted respondents to register whether or not, and to what extent they felt a school librarian was obligated to perform each task. The responses were recorded on a Likert-type scale or five point continuum ranging from highly negative to highly positive. The response categories for each item were:

1. Definitely should not
2. Preferably should not
3. May or may not

4. Preferably should

5. Definitely should

The degree to which each task is actually performed was ascertained through the use of a parallel Likert scale applied to the same items but administered to librarians only. This information was obtained from librarians on the basis that they are in the best position to know and report on actual practice. The response categories for actual performance on each item were:

1. Never do

2. Rarely do

3. Sometimes do

4. Usually do

5. Always do

The responses were weighted in direct proportion to the degree of obligation or of fulfillment. That is, the "definitely should not" response was weighted one while the "definitely should" response was weighted five, and, for the actual performance measurement, the "never do" response was weighted one while the "always do" response was weighted five.

Testing the Instrument

The instrument was refined with the assistance of a panel of experts in the field of school libraries. These seven experts included professors of Education and of Library Science, the Provincial School Library Consultant, and supervisors and consultants with the Edmonton Public School Board and the Sturgeon School Division.

After an initial questionnaire of fifty items was constructed, it was submitted to these judges for evaluation and comment. They were requested to comment on the clarity of the statements, the appropriateness of the tasks, and the comprehensiveness of the questionnaire. A copy of the letter of request forwarded to the panel of judges is included in Appendix B. Interviews were also arranged with three of the members of the panel in which discussion of various items accomplished further clarification.

As a result of this procedure a number of the tasks were rephrased, some which were too broad in scope were narrowed or divided, and a few which had been overlooked were added. The revised questionnaire containing fifty-five task items is contained in Appendix A.

COLLECTION OF DATA

To elicit co-operation of the school superintendents in the counties, school divisions and districts in which the sample schools were located, a letter was forwarded explaining the study and requesting permission to approach the schools. A copy of the letter is included in Appendix B. Upon receipt of the letters of permission, which were returned by all the superintendents contacted, the materials for the study were forwarded to the schools.

The names of the principals selected on the basis of the librarian sample were obtained from a list compiled

by the Department of Education.¹ The names of the teachers in each school were obtained from the files of the Department of Education with the exception of those in the Edmonton Public Schools which were supplied by the individual principals.

All the materials to be distributed to a given school were forwarded under one cover to the principal of the school. Included in this material were letters of explanation and questionnaires for the librarian, the principal and the teachers, specified by name, included in the sample. The principal was asked to return all the completed questionnaires from his school. Copies of the explanatory letters are included in Appendix B.

The procedure of having respondents complete the questionnaire only once could render questionable the reliability of the data since the individual task items might be differently rated by the same respondent at a different time. However, due to experimental constraints, a second administration of the questionnaire was impracticable.

Percentage of Responses

Ninety-three percent of the principals, 83 percent of the librarians and 71 percent of the teachers returned completed questionnaires. A summary of the number of

¹Operational Research Branch, Department of Education, Government of Alberta. List of Operating Schools in Alberta 1970-1971. (Mimeographed).

questionnaires forwarded to and received from the three groups is contained in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Responses by Groups Included in the Study

Group	Questionnaires Forwarded	Questionnaires Returned	Per Cent Returned
Principals	60	56	93.33
Librarians	60	50	83.33
Teachers	160	114	71.25

TYPE OF ANALYSIS OF DATA

Data from the questionnaires were processed largely through the use of data processing equipment although some of the calculations were performed manually. For each task a frequency distribution for the five response positions was made, and the mean and the standard deviation were calculated. The tasks were then ranked for each group according to the relative size of their means. To identify significant differences between the respective rankings of the tasks and between the degree of obligation attached to each task, certain statistical tests were used.

Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient Test

The Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient test was used to compare the composite rankings of the fifty-five tasks by two groups in order to obtain a measure of their agreement. According to Siegel, "It is a measure of association which requires that both variables be measured in at least an ordinal scale so that the objects or individuals under study may be ranked in two-ordered series."² In regard to the power-efficiency of the test Siegel further states, "The efficiency of the Spearman rank correlation when compared to the most powerful parametric correlation, the Pearson r , is about 91 percent."³

A group mean was calculated for each of the fifty-five tasks of the school librarian. Task means, calculated to two decimal places, were used as the basis for determining the rank orderings of the tasks for each group. However, since the reliability of the data is debatable, the determining of task placement within the rank order based on the second decimal may be questioned. The Spearman's rho test was used to determine the significance of the difference in opinion expressed by pairs of groups.

The t test

The t test was used to identify rating distribution differences for each of the fifty-five tasks between the

²Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956) p. 202

³Ibid., p. 213.

various groups. The method of calculating the t ratio was that described by Ferguson for independent samples.⁴

However, there are three basic assumptions that underlie the use of parametric tests such as the t test. The first assumption is that the measures to be analysed are continuous measures with equal intervals, thus making it possible to perform the basic arithmetic operations.

The second assumption is that of normality. In using the t test it is assumed that the samples have been drawn from populations that are normally distributed.

The third assumption is that the groups are statistically the same, and therefore their variances are homogeneous.

In a discussion of the above assumptions Kerlinger states:

The evidence to date is that the importance of normality and homogeneity is overrated . . . Unless there is good evidence to believe that the populations are rather seriously non-normal and that variances are heterogeneous, it is usually unwise to use a nonparametric statistical test in place of a parametric one. The reason for this is that the parametric tests are almost always more powerful than non-parametric tests.⁵

The t test was deemed appropriate for the present study since the Likert scale used in the instrument was

⁴George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (Toronto:McGraw-Hill Cook Co., 1959), p. 167-169.

⁵Kerlinger, Fred N., Foundations of Behavioral Research (Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967), p. 258-259.

assumed to be an equal interval scale and since an examination of the data in the frequency distributions for each task did not reveal any gross departures from normality. However, it was deemed advisable to analyse group differences statistically for homogeneity of variance.

The results of the t test must be interpreted with the knowledge that, since 350 tests were performed, a significant difference could result from chance on one percent of these tests.

Analysis of Variance

In the analysis of the differences in the means for each task among the various groups, an Analysis of Variance was conducted, at the .01 level of confidence, to ascertain whether or not homogeneity of variance existed.

The Welch Test

Where the variances were found to be heterogeneous, further analysis was required. Methods to be used when variances are unequal have been developed by Cochran and Cox and by Welch. Where Cochran and Cox adjust the value of t, the Welch method makes an adjustment in the degrees of freedom. The Welch test was considered most appropriate for this study. Therefore, when the analysis of variance indicated a significant difference in variance, the task was further analysed by the Welch test to determine whether or not a significant difference did in fact exist in the means at the .01 level of significance.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter is devoted to an analysis of the data collected to test the six hypotheses relating to the tasks of the school librarian. It first considers the composite agreement among librarians, principals, and teachers by examining the differences of opinion revealed by their relative rank orderings of the tasks. These ideal rank orderings are also compared with the actual rank order reported by librarians. The next section considers the tasks individually in order to compare the opinions of librarians, principals and teachers regarding the degree to which each task should be mandatory, and to compare the expectations of the three groups with actual practice. The fifty-five tasks are categorized according to type and are dealt with in clusters in order to determine the general areas of librarian performance in which the greatest disagreement arose.

HYPOTHESES TESTED

The six hypotheses which are concerned with a comparison of the opinions of the various groups and between these group opinions and actual practice are restated here for the reader's convenience.

1. Librarians and principals view similarly the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory.

2. Librarians and teachers view similarly the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory.

3. Principals and teachers view similarly the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory.

4. The opinions which the librarian holds regarding the degree to which his possible tasks should be mandatory and the degree to which they are actually performed are similar.

5. Principals' opinions regarding the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory and the degree to which they are actually performed are similar.

6. Teachers' opinions regarding the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory and the degree to which they are actually performed are similar.

The rank order of the fifty-five tasks as perceived by the librarian and his referent groups is shown in Table 2. These rank orders are based on the opinions of the three groups regarding the degree of obligation which should, ideally, be associated with each task. It therefore represents ideal practice in respect to the school librarian's tasks as perceived by librarians, principals and teachers. The rank order of the tasks according to actual practice, as compared to the ideal rank orderings by the three groups is shown in Table 3.

The mean for each group, derived from the frequency distributions shown in Tables I to LV, Appendix C, is indicated in Tables 2 and 3. This figure indicates the

TABLE 2

Comparison of the Expectations of Librarians, Principals and Teachers Regarding Possible Tasks of the School Librarian

Task	Librarians N = 50			Principals N = 56			Teachers N = 114		
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
Administrative Tasks									
1	10	4.62	0.89	16.5	4.30**	0.78	26	3.89*	0.95
5	11.5	4.58	0.83	7	4.59	0.80	1.5	4.79	0.55
12	3	4.84	0.42	3	4.80	0.44	3	4.76	0.48
13	30	4.12	1.24	29.5	3.91	1.07	18.5	4.19	0.96
20	3.75	3.70	0.81	38	3.63	0.86	33.5	3.69	0.82
23	22	4.40	0.89	12	4.46**	0.60	14.5	4.26	0.69
26	6.5	4.72	0.53	1.5	4.84	0.37	6	4.45	0.69
28	44	3.36	1.35	41	3.41**	1.08	39	3.47	1.24
33	17.5	4.46	0.75	5	4.68	0.47	9	4.33	0.67
37	17.5	4.46	0.70	14.5	4.36	0.64	18.5	4.19	0.70
41	31	4.08	1.02	36.5	3.66	1.04	35	3.68	1.04
43	14.5	4.50	0.64	14.5	4.36*	0.67	13	4.27*	0.75
44	3	4.84	0.50	9.5	4.52*	0.60	8	4.40*	0.75
45	25.5	4.26	0.98	33	3.75	0.89	32	3.74*	1.12
48	27.5	4.22	0.86	26.5	3.96	0.86	28	3.88	0.88
49	14.5	4.50	0.67	8	4.54	0.60	12	4.29	0.63
52	17.5	4.46	0.73	19	4.27	0.83	11	4.31	0.77
53	21	4.42	0.75	22	4.13	0.76	17	4.23	0.91

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Task	Librarians N = 50			Principals N = 56			Teachers N = 114		
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
Educational Tasks									
2	1	4.88	0.50	4	4.77	0.50	4	4.74	0.46
3	3	4.84	0.41	1.5	4.84	0.41	1.5	4.79*	0.47
7	45	3.06	1.05	46	2.77	0.91	53	2.54*	0.95
8	17.5	4.46	0.78	21	4.14	0.81	25	3.95*	0.79
9	23.5	4.30	0.73	28	3.95	0.91	37	3.58	0.95
10	8	4.68	0.58	9.5	4.52	0.65	5	4.49	0.73
14	29	4.18	0.93	20	4.18	0.73	22	4.08	0.84
15	39	3.64	0.97	35	3.71*	0.77	38	3.51*	0.95
17	27.5	4.22	0.73	36.5	3.66	0.93	36	3.60*	1.12
19	20	4.44	0.78	23.5	4.11*	0.70	24	4.05	0.78
22	33	4.02	0.95	23.5	4.11	0.79	31	3.75*	0.77
24	5	4.76	0.51	6	4.64	0.55	7	4.43*	0.76
27	34	3.94	0.76	33	3.75*	0.85	41	3.34*	1.05
29	6.5	4.72	0.45	13	4.54	0.65	23	4.06	0.75
30	46	2.96	1.06	45	2.88	1.09	51.5	2.58	1.10
32	32	4.06	0.90	31	3.88	0.89	29.5	3.78*	0.89
34	13	4.52	0.64	16.5	4.30	0.73	20	4.18*	0.74
35	23.5	4.30	0.81	26.5	3.96*	0.96	27	3.82	0.99
42	36	3.72	1.13	44	2.95	1.09	42	3.30*	1.13
46	11.5	4.58	0.53	18	4.29	0.67	21	4.16*	0.85
47	25.5	4.26	0.84	25	4.02	0.94	33.5	3.69*	0.88
55	35	3.84	0.81	39	3.50	0.94	40	3.40	1.02

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Task	Librarians N = 50			Principals N = 56			Teachers N = 114		
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
Technical Tasks									
4	41	3.52	1.42	33	3.75	1.37	14.5	4.26*	1.19
11	43	3.42	1.37	29.5	3.91	1.24	16	4.25*	1.10
21	37.5	3.70	1.15	42	3.27	1.15	45	3.14	1.15
36	42	3.46	0.88	43	3.09	0.95	43	3.20	0.95
39	40	3.62	1.32	40	3.43	1.32	29.5	3.78	1.07
40	9	4.66	0.55	11	4.50	0.65	10	4.32	0.80
Non-Professional Tasks									
6	49	2.18	1.01	49	2.38**	1.01	48	2.90*	1.19
16	54	1.52	0.96	52	1.84**	1.52	48	2.69*	1.31
18	51	1.90	1.04	51	1.91**	1.04	50	2.67*	1.18
25	50	2.16	1.30	50	2.32**	1.05	47	3.03*	1.22
31	52	1.86	1.30	53	1.79**	0.90	51.5	2.58*	1.32
38	55	1.44	0.88	54.5	1.55**	1.02	54	2.41	1.27
50	47	2.72	1.43	48	2.55	1.10	46	3.07	1.12
51	53	1.76	1.07	54.5	1.55**	0.84	55	1.71	1.02
54	48	2.72	1.39	47	2.64	1.16	44	3.17	1.22

*Principals' and Teachers expectations which differed significantly from those of librarians at the .01 level, by the t test.

**Principals' expectations which differed significantly from those of Teachers at the .01 level, by the t test.

TABLE 3

Comparison of Actual Performance with Expectations of Librarians, Teachers and Principals Regarding the Degree of Obligation and Relative Importance of the Tasks

Task	Actual Practice			Librarians' Ideal			Principals' Ideal			Teachers' Ideal		
	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
Administrative Tasks												
1	7	4.42	0.60	10	4.62	0.89	16.5	4.30	0.78	26	3.89*	0.95
5	3	4.54	0.64	11.5	4.58*	0.83	7	4.59*	0.80	1.5	4.79*	0.55
12	11	4.22	0.67	3	4.84	0.42	3	4.80*	0.44	3	4.76	0.48
13	6	4.44	0.85	30	4.12*	1.24	29.5	3.91*	1.07	18.5	4.19*	0.96
20	51	2.20	0.29	37.5	3.70*	0.81	38	3.63*	0.86	33.5	3.69*	0.82
23	38.5	3.08	1.44	22	4.40*	0.89	12	4.46*	0.60	14.5	4.26*	0.69
26	28.5	3.34	1.09	6.5	4.72	0.53	1.5	4.84	0.37	6	4.45	0.69
28	20	3.84	1.08	44	3.36*	1.35	41	3.41*	1.08	39	3.47*	1.24
33	17	3.90	1.88	17.5	4.46*	0.75	5	4.68*	0.47	9	4.33	0.67
37	18	3.86	0.92	17.5	4.46	0.70	14.5	4.36	0.64	18.5	4.19	0.70
41	22	3.82	1.23	31	4.08*	1.02	36.5	3.66*	1.04	35	3.68*	1.04
43	27	3.40	1.10	14.5	4.50	0.64	14.5	4.36	0.67	13	4.27	0.75
44	2	4.58	0.92	3	4.84	0.50	9.5	4.52	0.60	8	4.40	0.75
45	23	3.62	1.51	25.5	4.26*	0.98	33	3.75*	0.89	32	3.74*	1.12
48	55	2.02	1.24	27.5	4.22*	0.86	26.5	3.96*	0.86	28	3.88*	0.88
49	24.5	3.46	1.19	14.5	4.50	0.67	8	4.54*	0.60	12	4.29*	0.63
52	1	4.68	0.51	17.5	4.46	0.73	19	4.27	0.83	11	4.31	0.77
53	10	4.26	1.04	21	4.42	0.75	22	4.13	0.76	17	4.23	0.91

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Task	Actual Practice		Librarians' Ideal		Principals' Ideal		Teachers' Ideal	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
		SD		SD		SD		SD
Technical Tasks								
4	30	3.30	1.51	3.52	1.42	3.75	1.37	4.26*
11	31.5	3.28	1.58	3.42	1.37	3.91*	1.24	4.25*
21	15.5	3.92	1.09	3.70*	1.15	3.27*	1.14	3.14*
36	48	2.48	0.88	3.46	0.88	3.09	0.95	3.20
39	20	3.84	1.43	3.62	1.32	3.43	1.32	3.78
40	12	4.20	0.82	4.66	0.55	4.50	0.65	4.32
Non-Professional Tasks								
6	38.5	3.08	1.02	2.18*	1.01	2.38*	1.01	2.90
16	52.5	2.18	1.32	1.52*	0.96	1.84*	1.01	2.69
18	43	2.94	1.19	1.90*	1.04	1.91*	1.04	2.67
25	38.5	3.08	1.44	2.16*	1.30	2.32*	1.05	3.03
31	44	2.86	1.44	1.86*	1.30	1.79*	0.90	2.58
38	49	2.38	1.34	1.44	0.88	1.55*	1.02	2.41
50	34	3.22	1.24	2.72*	1.43	2.55*	1.10	3.07*
51	35	3.14	1.31	1.76	1.07	1.55*	0.84	1.71
54	28.5	3.34	1.23	2.72	1.39	2.64	1.16	3.17

* Librarians', principals' and teachers' expectations which differed significantly from actual practice at the .01 level, by the t test.

average degree of obligation associated with each task by the designated group. The column headed SD in each of Tables 2 and 3 refers to the standard deviation and shows the degree of consensus within the groups as to the position of the task on the scale. The smaller the standard deviation, the greater is the agreement. However, the size of the standard deviation is meaningful only in relation to the standard deviation values of the other tasks.

COMPARISON OF LIBRARIANS', PRINCIPALS' AND TEACHERS'
COMPOSITE ASSESSMENT OF THE SCHOOL
LIBRARIAN'S TASKS

To obtain a measure of the composite agreement regarding the librarian's tasks which existed between the various groups, a Spearman's rho correlation was used. The purpose of this test was to determine whether or not a significant relationship existed between the rank orderings of the tasks by one group and that by another group.

The correlations which were revealed between the rankings of the tasks by the three groups, and the correlations between group rankings and that based on actual practice are shown on Table 4. These figures are well beyond the value required for significance at the .01 level. These positive correlations indicate that a high degree of agreement existed among the three groups regarding the relative importance of the librarian's tasks, and that the three groups were largely in agreement with current practice.

Because of these high correlations none of the six hypotheses can be rejected. Therefore, on the strength of the relative rankings of the tasks alone, the librarian would not find himself in marked disagreement with either of his referent groups nor would the referent groups disagree strongly with one another, as posited by Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3. Furthermore, on the basis of this measurement, none of the three groups would disagree markedly with current practice, as suggested by Hypotheses 4, 5 and 6.

TABLE 4

Spearman's Rank Correlation for Group Rankings

	Librarians (Ideal)	Principals	Teachers	Librarians (Actual)
Librarians (Ideal)				
Principals	.95			
Teachers	.87	.94		
Librarians (Actual)	.67	.62	.69	

Required for significance: $.01 = .35^1$

A Spearman's rho of plus one, a perfect positive correlation, would have meant unanimous agreement regarding

¹Henry E. Garrett, Statistics in Psychology and Education. (Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958), p. 201.

the ranking of the tasks. None of the six hypotheses could then have been rejected, and further analysis would have been unnecessary.

However, since complete agreement did not exist on the ranking between pairs of position groups, the t test was used to discover the specific tasks in which disagreement arose. These specific tasks, grouped into categories, became the indicators of areas in which the three groups found themselves in disagreement. The six hypotheses were thus tested again in terms of individual tasks.

COMPARISON OF GROUP OPINIONS AND OF OPINIONS WITH ACTUAL PRACTICE ON INDIVIDUAL TASKS

The t Test

The t test measured the difference at the .01 level of significance which existed between pairs of groups in regard to each librarian's task.

Out of the fifty-five tasks, there were four in which librarians' opinions differed significantly from those of principals, there were twenty-six in which librarians' opinions differed significantly from those of teachers, and there were thirteen in which principals' and teachers' opinions differed significantly from one another.

In the comparison of the ideal perceptions of the three groups with actual practice, there were thirty-five tasks in which the librarians' ideal perceptions differed significantly from actual practice; in thirty-six of the

tasks the expectations of principals differed significantly from actual practice; in twenty-seven of the tasks the expectations of teachers differed significantly from actual practice.

Analysis of Variance

An analysis of variance was also performed for each task to ascertain whether or not homogeneity of variance existed between groups, as the t test assumes. When the Analysis of Variance determined that the variances of the two groups differed significantly, the results of the t test became invalid. Therefore a Welch test was applied to each task in which the variance was found not to be homogeneous.

The Welch Test

In the tasks where the assumption of homogeneity of variance was shown to be untenable, the Welch test made a correction by adjusting the degrees of freedom.

In the comparison of the ideal perceptions of librarians and principals, the Welch test was not required for any task in which the t test had shown a significant difference. When the opinions of librarians and teachers were compared, the Welch test was required for nine tasks where the t test had shown a significant difference. In a comparison of the expectations of principals and teachers, for four of the tasks in which the t test had shown a significant difference the Welch test was required.

In the comparison of librarians' ideal perceptions with actual practice, the Welch test was required for thirteen of the tasks in which the t test had shown a significant difference. When principals' expectations were compared with actual practice, the Welch test was required for twelve of the tasks where the difference was significant according to the t test. In the comparison of teachers' expectations with actual practice the Welch test was required for fourteen of the tasks where the t test had shown the means to be significantly different.

In all the aforementioned tasks the significant differences in mean which were found by the t test were substantiated by the Welch test.

Administrative Tasks

The administrative tasks in which significant differences of opinion were found between pairs of groups can be seen in Table 2. Table 3 shows the administrative tasks in which significant differences were revealed between actual practice and the expectations of the three groups. The obtained values of t between the ideal perceptions of pairs of groups is shown in Table 5. The values of t between group opinions and actual practice can be found in Table 6. The frequency distributions of responses for each task are shown in Table I to LV, Appendix C.

TABLE 5

Administrative Tasks for Which Ideal Perceptions Differed
between Groups at the .01 Level of Significance

Group Expectations Compared									
Librarians and Principals			Librarians and Teachers			Principals and Teachers			
Obtained	Welch	Obtained	Proba-	Welch	Obtained	Proba-	Obtained	Welch	Proba-
t	bility	t	bility	bility	t	bility	t	bility	bility
1					4.60	<.001	N.R.	2.83	.005
26								3.96	<.001
33								3.44	<.001
44	2.95	.004	N.R.		3.75	<.001	<.001		
45	2.78	.006	N.R.		2.85	.004	N.R.		
48					2.78	.006	N.R.		

N.R.: Welch Test not required.

TABLE 6

Administrative Tasks for Which Ideal Perceptions Differed from Actual Practice at the .01 Level of Significance

Task	Group Expectations Compared to Actual Practice									
	Librarians (Actual and Ideal)		Librarians (Actual) and Principals (Ideal)		Librarians (Actual) and Teachers (Ideal)		Librarians (Actual) and Librarians (Actual) and Teachers (Ideal)		Librarians (Actual) and Librarians (Actual) and Teachers (Ideal)	
	Obtained	Proba- bility	Obtained	Proba- bility	Obtained	Proba- bility	Obtained	Proba- bility	Obtained	Proba- bility
	t		t		t		t		t	
1							3.63	<.001		<.001
12	5.49	<.001			5.29	<.001			5.81	<.001
13			2.76	<.001				N.R.		
20	8.60	<.001			8.19	<.001			10.30	<.001
23	5.45	<.001			6.52	<.001			7.07	<.001
26	7.98	<.001			9.61	<.001			7.80	<.001
33	3.39	<.001			5.73	<.001			3.43	<.001
37	3.64	<.001			3.23	.002				
43	6.07	<.001			5.44	<.001			10.45	<.001
48	10.22	<.001			9.19	<.001			10.45	<.001
49	5.34	<.001			5.93	<.001			5.78	<.001
52			3.00	.003					3.10	.002

N.R.: Welch Test not required.

Eighteen of the fifty-five possible librarian's tasks fall into the category of administrative tasks. The expectations of teachers differed from those of librarians on four of the administrative tasks while those of principals and librarians differed on two. The expectations of principals also differed from those of teachers for three tasks.

Between actual practice and the ideal perceptions of librarians, significant differences occurred on nine of the administrative tasks. In eleven of the eighteen tasks, significant differences were found between actual practice and the expectations of principals. Significant differences were revealed between the expectations of teachers and actual practice in ten of the eighteen administrative tasks.

In four of the eighteen administrative tasks, no significant differences were revealed between group opinions or between the various group opinions and actual practice.

Task 1. Evaluate and select books and other materials.

In a comparison of the ideal perceptions of the three groups, significant differences appeared between librarians and teachers and between principals and teachers in respect to this task. It can be seen in the frequency distributions (Table I Appendix C) and in Table 2 that librarians placed more emphasis on this task than did principals or teachers, with a mean of 4.62 compared to

4.30 and 3.89 respectively. From Table 5 it can be seen that the obtained value of t was 4.60 between librarians and teachers and 2.83 between principals and teachers, both of which exceed the required .01 level of significance.

Librarians ranked this task tenth while principals ranked it sixteenth, and teachers placed it twenty-sixth in order of importance (Table 2).

Significant differences occurred between actual practice and the expectations of only one group, the teachers, in respect to this task. The frequency distributions (Table I, Appendix C) and Table 3 show that teachers, with a mean of 3.89, placed less importance on this task than was actually accorded it by librarians, with a mean of 4.42. The difference in means, as shown by the t value of 3.63, is significant beyond the .01 confidence level (Table 6). The marked difference in standard deviation, .60 for actual performance compared to .95 for the teachers' expectations, indicates that there was more agreement among librarians in actual practice than among teachers according to their expectations. Teachers ranked the task twenty-sixth while it was actually placed seventh in order of importance by librarians (Table 3).

Divergent expectations were revealed between librarians and teachers and between teachers and principals, while the expectations of teachers also differed from actual practice in regard to the selection and evaluation of materials.

Task 12. Create an attractive, welcoming atmosphere in the library.

Table 2 shows that no significant differences were revealed between the expectations of the three groups in regard to this task.

Significant differences were found, however, between actual practice and the expectation of all three groups (Table 3). The frequency distributions (Table XII, Appendix C) and Table 3 show that all groups stressed this task more than did librarians in actual practice. A mean of 4.22 was found for actual practice compared to 4.84 for librarians' ideals, 4.80 for those of principals, and 4.76 for the teachers' expectations. The obtained values of t were 5.48 between actual practice and librarians' ideals, 5.29 between actual practice and principals' expectations and 5.81 between actual practice and the ideal perceptions of teachers (Table 6). All of these t values exceed the required .01 level of significance. Table 3 shows that librarians, teachers, and principals ranked the task ideally in third place while it was placed eleventh in actual practice.

It is evident that in actual practice librarians did not meet their own expectations nor those of their referent groups in regard to creating an attractive atmosphere in the library.

Task 13. Order and receive books and other materials.

A comparison of the expectations of the three groups with one another revealed no significant differences in

respect to this task (Table 2).

Significant differences, as shown on Table 3, were found between actual practice and the expectations of only one group, the principals. The librarians, with a mean of 4.44 actually accorded this task greater emphasis than principals, with a mean 3.91, expected them to place on it (Table 3). The value of t between these two groups was found to be 2.76 which is significant beyond the .01 level (Table 4). In actual practice, librarians ranked this task sixth while, ideally, principals gave it a rank number of 29.5 (Table 3).

Though the three groups agreed on the degree of obligation associated with this task, a discrepancy was found to exist between the expectations of principals and actual practice in regard to the acquisition of materials.

Task 20. Co-ordinate the services of the school library with those of the public library.

No significant differences were found between the expectations of the three groups regarding Task 20.

In the comparison of expectations with actual practice, the librarians actually placed a lesser degree of importance on this task than was expected by all three groups, as can be seen by the frequency distributions (Table XX, Appendix C) and Table 3. The mean shown here for actual practice is 2.20 compared to 3.70 for the librarian's ideals, 3.63 for those of principals, and 3.69 for those of teachers.

The values of t between actual practice and librarians', principals' and teachers' expectations were 8.60, 8.19 and 10.30 all of which greatly exceeded the .01 level of significance (Table 6). The marked difference in standard deviation, .29 for actual practice compared to .81, .86, and .82 for the ideal perceptions of librarians, principals and teachers respectively, shows that there was much more consensus among librarians in actual practice than among any of the three groups in expectations (Table 3). Ideally, librarians gave this task a rank number of 37.5, principals gave it thirty-eight, and teachers 33.5, while in actual practice it was placed fifty-first in order of importance.

Although agreement appeared among the expectations of the three groups, current practice did not meet these expectations in respect to co-ordinating school and public library services.

Task 23. In co-operation with the administration and staff, formulate a library policy statement (i.e. a statement of the philosophy of the library).

It can be seen from Table 2 that no significant differences existed between the ideal perceptions of the three groups respecting this task.

Significant differences were found, however, between actual practice and the expectations of all three groups (Table 3). The frequency distributions (Table XXIII, Appendix C) and Table 3 show that all groups stressed this

task more than did librarians in actual practice. A mean of 3.08 was found for actual practice while a mean of 4.40 was found for librarians' expectations, 4.46 for those of principals, and 4.26 for those of teachers. The obtained t values were 5.45 between actual practice and librarians' ideal perceptions, 6.53 between actual practice and principals' expectations, and 7.07 between actual practice and teachers' expectations (Table 6). The standard deviations, 1.44 for actual practice compared to .89 for librarians' expectations, .60 for principals' expectations and .69 for teachers' expectations, indicate a greater dispersion of responses among librarians in actual practice than in the other three groups in expectations. Table 3 shows that the task was actually given a rank number of 38.5 whereas librarians ranked it ideally in twenty-second place, principals placed it twelfth, and teachers gave it a rank number of 14.5.

In actual practice, librarians did not meet their own expectations or those of their referent groups in regard to formulating a library policy statement.

Task 26. Plan with the administration and staff for the integration of the library program into the total educational scheme.

In a comparison the ideal perceptions of the three groups, significant differences were revealed between those of teachers and principals. Table 2 shows that principals

emphasized the task more than did teachers, with a mean of 4.84, compared to 4.45. The value of t between these two groups was 3.96 (Table 5), which is significant at the .01 level. Principals gave it a rank number of 1.5 while teachers ranked it sixth in order of importance.

Significant differences were also found between actual practice and the expectations of librarians, principals and teacher, as shown by a mean of 3.34, compared to 4.72, 4.84, and 4.45 respectively (Table 3). The t values between actual practice and librarians', principals', and teachers' expectations were 7.98, 9.62, and 7.80 respectively, all of which greatly exceed the required .01 level of significance (Table 6). Table 3 shows a marked difference in standard deviation, 1.09 for librarians in actual practice compared to .53, .37, and .69 for the expectations of librarians, principals, and teachers respectively. These figures indicate a lesser degree of consensus in actual practice than among any of the groups in their opinions. In actual practice this task was given a rank number of 28.5 as compared to 6.5 by librarians in their ideal responses, 1.5 by principals, and 6.0 by teachers (Table 3).

It is apparent that teachers and principals did not agree regarding the integration of the library program into the total instructional scheme, and that actual practice did not meet the expectations of any of the groups in this respect.

Task 33. Publicize and promote the library program (i.e. the program of instruction, services and activities which the library provides to students and teachers) by such means as displays, bulletins, and personal contact.

In a comparison of ideal perceptions regarding this task, a significant difference was found to exist between principals, with a mean of 4.68, and teachers, whose mean was 4.33 (Table 2). The t values between these two groups was 3.44 (Table 4), which is significant at the .01 level. It can be seen in Table 2 that principals ranked this task fifth while teachers ranked it ninth.

In comparing actual practice with group expectations significant differences were found in all three comparisons. In ideal terms, librarians, principals and teachers all gave greater stress to this task than was actually given it, as shown by the respective means of 4.46, 4.68 and 4.33 compared to 3.90 (Table 3). The values of t were 3.39 between librarians' actual performance and their ideals, 5.73 between actual performance and principals' expectations and 3.43 between actual practice and teachers' expectations. All these t values exceed the .01 level of significance (Table 6). Much less agreement existed within the librarian group according to actual practice than within any of the three groups according to expectations. This is shown by the marked difference in standard deviation, 1.88 for actual practice compared to .75, .47, and .67 for the expectations of librarians, principals and teachers respectively (Table 3).

It can be seen in Table 3, however, that this task was ranked seventeenth in actual practice while, ideally, it was given a rank number of 17.5 by librarians, it was ranked fifth by principals, and it was placed ninth by teachers.

Disagreement arose between the opinions of principals and teachers regarding the promotion of the library program as well as between actual practice and all group expectations.

Task 37. Involve teachers in evaluation and selection of books and materials.

No significant differences appeared in the ideal perceptions of the three groups in regard to this task.

In a comparison of actual practice with group expectations, significant differences were revealed between actual practice and the expectations of librarians and principals. Ideally, greater emphasis was placed on this task by librarians, with a mean of 4.46 and by principals with a mean of 4.36 than was actually accorded it by librarians, whose mean was 3.86 (Table 3). The value of t was 3.64 between actual practice and librarians' expectations, and 3.24 between actual practice and principals' expectations. Both of these t values are significant beyond the .01 level (Table 6). This task was actually ranked eighteenth compared to the ideal rank numbers of 17.5 and 14.5 given it by librarians and principals respectively.

Although agreement existed in ideal perceptions of the degree of obligation associated with this task, neither librarians nor principals agreed with current practice.

Task 43. Evaluate the library program, services and materials in terms of staff and student needs and of the Canadian standards.

No significant differences occurred between the ideal perceptions of the three groups in respect to this task.

In a comparison of ideal perceptions with actual practice, all groups gave significantly greater emphasis to this task than was actually accorded it. Table 3 shows a mean of 3.40 for actual practice compared to 4.50, 4.36, and 4.27 for the expectations of librarians, principals and teachers respectively. The values of t between actual practice and librarians', principals' and teachers' expectations were 6.07, 5.45 and 5.86 respectively (Table 5) all of which are significant well beyond the .01 level. The standard deviations of 1.10 for actual practice compared to .64 for the expectations of librarians, .67 for those of principals and .75 for those of teachers indicate markedly more disagreement among librarians in actual practice than among any group in expectations. It was given an ideal rank number of 14.5 by librarians, 14.5 by principals and 13 by teachers while it was actually ranked twenty-seventh in order of importance.

Though agreement existed in expectations regarding library evaluation, actual practice did not meet the expectations of any of the three groups.

Task 44. Make provision for the use of the library by classes, groups and individuals.

Significant differences in expectations regarding this task were found between librarians and principals and between librarians and teachers. It was emphasized more by librarians, with a mean of 4.84, than by principals, with a mean of 4.50, or by teachers, with a mean of 4.40 (Table 2). The values of t were 2.95 between librarians and principals and 3.75 between librarians and teachers, as shown on Table 5. Both these differences exceed the .01 level of significance. This task was ranked third in importance by librarians, while principals gave it a rank number of 9.5, and teachers ranked it eighth.

No significant differences were revealed between actual practice and the expectations of the three groups.

The responses regarding the scheduling of the library indicate that, although a disparity existed between the librarian and both his referent groups in ideal perceptions, all groups were in agreement with actual practice.

Task 45. Prepare and administer the library budget.

In comparing ideal perceptions regarding this task, significant differences were found between those of librarians and principals and between those of librarians and teachers. Librarians placed the most importance on this task, as shown on Table 2, with a mean of 4.26 compared to 3.75 for principals and 3.74 for teachers. The t value, between librarians and principals was 2.79 and 2.85 between librarians

and teachers. Both of these differences are beyond the required .01 level of significance (Table 5). Librarians gave it a rank number of 25.5 while principals ranked it thirty-third and teachers placed it thirty-second among the tasks.

No significant differences were found between actual practice and group expectations.

Differences in opinions arose between the librarian and his two referent groups regarding budgeting for the library, but all groups approved of current practice.

Task 48. Plan library quarters and facilities for new or renovated libraries.

A significant difference was found between the ideal perceptions of librarians and teachers regarding this task. Librarians placed a greater degree of obligation on it with a mean of 4.22 compared to 3.88 for teachers (Table 2). The value of t between these two groups was 2.78 which is significant at the .01 level (Table 5). Librarians gave it a rank number of 27.5 while teachers ranked it twenty-eighth.

In a comparison of actual practice with group expectations Table 3 shows that a significant difference occurred between actual practice and the expectations of all groups. Librarians actually placed much less stress on this task than it was ideally perceived to merit as shown by the mean of 2.02 for actual practice compared to 4.22

for the expectations of librarians, 3.96 for those of principals and 3.88 for those of teachers (Table 3). The values of t for this task were 10.21 between actual practice and the opinions of librarians, 9.19 between actual practice and those of principals, and 10.45 between actual practice and those of librarians. All of these figures greatly exceed the .01 level of significance (Table 6). In actual practice it was ranked fifty-fifth among the tasks, while, ideally, librarians gave it a rank number of 27.5, principals gave it 26.5 and teachers placed twenty-eighth.

Librarians and teachers were found to disagree regarding the planning of libraries, and none of the three groups agreed with current practice.

Task 49. In co-operation with teachers, plan and implement a library program.

No significant differences were found to exist in the ideal perceptions of the three groups regarding this task.

In actual practice this task was accorded significantly less importance than it was in the opinion of any group. Table 3 shows a mean of 3.64 for actual practice compared to 4.50 for the expectations of librarians, 4.54 for those of principals, and 4.29 for those of teachers. The values of t were 5.43 between actual practice and the ideal perceptions of librarians, 5.93 between actual practice and those of principals, and 5.78 between actual practice and

those of teachers (Table 6). These differences are all well beyond the required .01 level of significance. The standard deviations were 1.19 for librarians according to actual practice, compared to .67 for librarians, .60 for principals and .63 for teachers according to their expectations (Table 3). These figures indicate greater agreement among the members of each group in opinion than among librarians in actual practice. In actual practice this task was given a rank number of 24.5 while, ideally, librarians gave it a number of 14.5, principals ranked it eighth in importance, and teachers placed it twelfth.

Although no disagreement existed in the opinions of the three groups regarding the planning and implementation of a library program, current librarian performance did not meet these expectations.

Task 52. Organize and oversee the circulation of library materials.

No significant differences were revealed in the ideal perceptions of the three groups regarding this task.

In comparing expectations with actual practice, significant differences were found between actual practice and the opinions of both principals and teachers, as shown by the mean of 4.68 compared to 4.27 and 4.31 respectively (Table 3). The t values were 3.00 between actual practice and principals' expectations and 3.11 between actual practice and those of teachers, both of which are significant beyond

the .01 level (Table 6). In actual practice this task was ranked first in importance while, ideally, it was ranked nineteenth by principals and eleventh by teachers.

Principals, librarians and teachers agreed in their opinions regarding the overseeing of circulation, but principals and teachers both disagreed with actual practice in this regard.

Administrative tasks for which no differences existed.

In four out of the eighteen administrative tasks, no significant differences were revealed either in the various group expectations or between these group expectations and actual practice. These were Tasks 5, 28, 41, and 53.

Task 5 is: Arrange the library and its materials for maximum accessibility.

Task 28 is: Assume responsibility for discipline of students using the library.

Task 41 is: Prepare statistical, financial and progress reports on the operation of the library.

Task 53 is: Train and supervise all paid, volunteer and/or student assistants.

Educational Tasks

The educational tasks in which significant differences of opinion existed between pairs of groups are shown in Table 2. The educational tasks in which differences were revealed between actual practice and the ideal perceptions of each group can be seen in Table 3. Table 7 shows the

TABLE 7
Educational Tasks for Which Ideal Perceptions Differed
between Groups at the .01 Level of Significance

Task	Librarians and Principals		Librarians and Teachers		Principals and Teachers	
	Obtained	Welch Proba- bility	Obtained	Proba- bility	Obtained	Proba- bility
7			3.14	.002		N.R.
8			3.80	<.001		N.R.
9			4.74	<.001		N.R.
17	3.38	.001	3.59	<.001		<.001
19			2.91	.004		N.R.
22					2.83	.005
24			2.79	.006		N.R.
27			3.61	<.001		.001
29			5.72	<.001		<.001
34			2.84	.005		N.R.
35			3.03	.003		N.R.
42	3.54	<.001			3.25	<.001
46			3.21	.002		N.R.
47			3.83	<.001		N.R.
55			2.66	.009		N.R.

N.R.: Welch Test not required.

tasks in which a significant t value was found between group expectations. The obtained t values which were found to be significant between actual practice and the various group expectations are shown in Table 8. The frequency distributions from which the means were derived are contained in Appendix C.

Twenty-two of the fifty-five tasks are classified as educational tasks. In comparing the ideal perceptions of the three groups regarding these possible educational tasks, a significant difference was found to exist between librarians and principals for only two tasks. Between the expectations of librarians and teachers, significant differences were found for thirteen of the twenty-two tasks. Between principals and teachers significant differences of opinion were found for thirteen of the twenty-two tasks. Between principals and teachers significant differences of opinion were found for two of the twenty-two tasks.

In a comparison of ideal perceptions with actual practice, significant differences appeared between librarians' actual performance and their ideals in eighteen of the twenty-two tasks. Between actual practice and the expectations of principals significant differences appeared for fifteen tasks. Significant differences between actual performance and the ideal perceptions of teachers occurred on twelve of these educational tasks.

In only one of the twenty-two educational tasks were no significant differences revealed either between

TABLE 8

Educational Tasks for Which Ideal Perceptions Differed from
Actual Practice at the .01 Level of Significance

Task	Librarians (Actual) and Librarians (Ideal)			Librarians (Actual) and Principals (Ideal)			Librarians (Actual) and Teachers (Ideal)		
	Obtained t	Proba- bility	Welch Proba- bility	Obtained t	Proba- bility	Welch Proba- bility	Obtained t	Proba- bility	Welch Proba- bility
2	4.27	<.001	<.001	2.84	.006	N.R.	3.31	<.001	N.R.
3	4.68	<.001	<.001	4.88	<.001	<.001	5.08	<.001	N.R.
7	4.75	<.001	N.R.	3.69	<.001	N.R.	2.77	.006	N.R.
8	9.60	<.001	N.R.	8.00	<.001	N.R.	8.35	<.001	N.R.
9	5.67	<.001	<.001	3.60	<.001	N.R.			
14	4.76	<.001	N.R.	5.54	<.001	N.R.	5.38	<.001	N.R.
15	4.70	<.001	N.R.	5.77	<.001	N.R.	4.96	<.001	N.R.
17	4.60	<.001	N.R.						
19	3.80	<.001	N.R.						
22	8.11	<.001	N.R.	9.50	<.001	N.R.	9.29	<.001	<.001
27	5.77	<.001	N.R.	4.56	<.001	N.R.			
29	8.29	<.001	<.001	6.25	<.001	<.001	4.49	<.001	N.R.
30	3.94	<.001	N.R.	3.45	<.001	N.R.			
32	6.47	<.001	<.001	5.90	<.001	<.001	6.73	<.001	<.001
35	5.29	<.001	<.001	3.79	<.001	<.001	3.82	<.001	<.001
42				5.09	<.001	N.R.	3.48	<.001	<.001
46	3.28	<.001	<.001						
47	5.46	<.001	<.001	4.29	<.001	N.R.	3.40	<.001	.003
55	3.95	<.001	<.001						

N.R.: Welch Test not required.

group opinions or between actual practice and the various group expectations.

Task 2. Become familiar with the educational program and curriculum of the school.

In a comparison of the ideal perceptions of librarians, principals and teachers, no significant differences were revealed regarding this task.

When actual practice was compared to the various group expectations, however, significant differences appeared in all three comparisons. It can be seen from the frequency distributions (Table II, Appendix C) and Table 3 that all groups emphasized this task more in ideal terms than did librarians in actual practice. A mean of 4.46 for actual practice may be compared with 4.88 for the expectations of librarians, 4.77 for those of principals and 4.75 for those of teachers. The values of t were 4.27 between actual practice and librarians' ideal perceptions, 2.84 between actual practice and principals' expectations and, 3.34 between actual practice and those of teachers, all of which differences exceed the .01 level of significance (Table 8). However, in actual practice this task was given a rank number of 4.5 while, ideally, librarians ranked it first and principals and teachers both ranked it fourth.

Although no disagreement existed in the opinions of the three groups actual performance did not meet the expectations of any group in respect to being familiar with the curriculum.

Task 3. Keep teachers informed regarding new and existing materials in the library.

No significant differences in opinion were found among the three groups concerning this task.

In actual practice librarians gave this task significantly less emphasis than librarians, principals, and teachers felt that it should receive, as shown by the means of 4.34 compared to 4.84, 4.84 and 4.79 respectively (Table 3). The obtained t between actual practice and librarians' expectations was 4.68; between actual practice and principals' expectations it was 4.88; between actual practice and teachers expectations it was 5.08. Table 8 shows these values to be significant well beyond the .01 level. This task was actually given a rank number of 8.5 compared to an ideal rank number of .03 by librarians and 1.5 by both principals and teachers.

All groups agreed about ideal practice concerning this task but in actual practice librarians did not meet their own expectations nor those of their referent groups with respect to informing teachers about materials in the library.

Task 7. Keep records of individual students' reading ability and interests.

In comparing the ideal perceptions of the three groups regarding this task a significant difference occurred between those of librarians and teachers. The mean of 3.06 for librarians compared to 2.54 for teachers indicates that

teachers cast a negative vote for this task as compared to a slightly positive one for librarians (Table 2). The obtained t between these two groups was 3.14, which was significant at the .01 level. Librarians ranked this task forty-fifth among their tasks while teachers placed it fifty-third.

In a comparison of group opinions with actual practice, although it was placed low in the scale by all groups, it was emphasized significantly less in actual practice than in the expectations of any group. Table 3 shows a mean of 2.08 for actual practice compared to 3.06 for librarians' ideals, 2.77 for those of principals and 2.54 for those of teachers. The values of t were 4.75 between librarians' opinions and actual practice, 3.69 between principals' opinions and actual practice and 2.77 between teachers' opinions and actual practice. All of these differences exceed the .01 level of significance (Table 8). In actual practice this task was ranked fifty-fourth while in ideal terms librarians placed it forty-fifth, principals placed it forty-sixth and teachers ranked it fifty-third.

In ideal perceptions only librarians and teachers disagreed, but none of the three groups agreed with actual practice in regard to keeping records of students' reading.

Task 8. Serve as resource consultant on curriculum committees and at department or grade meeting.

The expectations of librarians and teachers were significantly different in respect to this task. Librarians, with a mean of 4.46, placed more emphasis on this task than did teachers with a mean of 3.95 (Table 2). The value of t between these two groups, 3.81, is shown by Table 7 to be significant at the .01 level. Librarians gave this task a rank number of 17.5 whereas teachers ranked it twenty-fifth.

In actual practice this task received much less emphasis than was ideally assigned to it by librarians, principals and teachers, as shown by the mean of 2.72 compared to 4.46, 4.14, and 3.95 respectively (Table 3). Between librarians' actual performance and their ideals for this task the value of t was 9.60; between actual practice and principals' expectations it was 8.00, and between actual practice and those of teachers it was 8.35. All of these differences greatly exceed the required .01 level of significance, as shown in Table 8. In actual practice this task was ranked forty-fifth among the tasks, while, ideally, librarians gave it a rank number of 17.5, principals ranked it twenty-first and teachers placed it twenty-fifth.

While only librarians and teachers disagreed in regard to the librarian's serving as a resource consultant, actual practice did not meet the expectations of any group.

Task 9. Prepare bibliographies for teacher use.

When the ideal perceptions of the three groups concerning this task were compared with one another, a

significant difference appeared between only one pair of groups, librarians and teachers. A mean of 4.30 for librarians compared to 3.58 for teachers shows that librarians placed greater importance on this task than did teachers (Table 2). The value of t between these two groups was 4.74, which is significant at the .01 level (Table 7). Librarians gave it a rank number of 23.5 while teachers ranked it thirty-seventh in importance.

In comparing actual practice with group opinions, significant differences appeared between actual practice and the expectations of librarians and principals. Table 3 shows a mean of 3.24 for actual practice compared to 4.30 for librarians' expectations and 3.95 for those of principals. The value of t between librarians' actual performance and their ideals was 5.67 while it was 3.60 between actual practice and principals' expectations. Both of these differences are well beyond the .01 level of significance (Table 8). Librarians actually ranked this task thirty-third while, ideally, they gave it a rank number of 23.5 and principals placed it twenty-eighth.

Librarians and teachers disagreed regarding the degree of obligation which should be associated with the preparations of bibliographies, and both librarians and teachers disagreed with actual practice.

Task 14. Help teachers to keep informed of current educational developments in their fields by providing relevant materials.

No significant differences were revealed between the ideal perceptions of the various groups concerning this task.

In actual practice librarians placed significantly less emphasis on this task than librarians, principals, and teachers felt it should receive, as shown by the mean of 3.28 compared to 4.18, 4.18 and 4.08 respectively (Table 2). The values of t shown in Table 8 were 4.76 between actual practice and librarians' expectations, 5.54 between actual practice and principals' expectations, and 5.38 between actual practice and teachers' expectations. These differences far exceed the required .01 level of significance. Librarians gave this task a rank number of 31.5 according to actual practice while ideally, they ranked it twenty-ninth, principals placed it twentieth, and teachers placed it twenty-second.

Agreement existed among the three groups regarding the librarian's task of keeping teachers informed of educational developments; however actual practice in this respect did not meet these expectations.

Task 15. Develop reading lists for students.

In the ideal perceptions of librarians, principals and teachers, no significant differences were found regarding this task.

In comparing actual practice to the various group opinions, significant differences were revealed in all three

comparisons. As shown in Table 3, the mean for actual practice was 2.68 compared to 3.64 for librarian's expectations, 3.71 for those of principals, and 3.51 for those of teachers. The value of t was found to be 4.70 between actual practice and the ideal perceptions of librarians, 5.77 between actual practice and those of principals, and 4.96 between actual practice and the expectations of teachers. All of these values are significant at the .01 level, as shown on Table 8. In actual practice this task was ranked forty-sixth while, ideally, librarians placed it thirty-ninth, principals ranked it thirty-fifth, and teachers ranked it thirty-eighth.

While opinions were generally similar regarding the developing of reading lists, actual practice in this respect did not meet the expectations of any group.

Task 17. Provide personal, social, vocational and educational guidance to students through the provision of suitable materials.

In the comparison of the expectations of the three groups, significant differences appeared between those of librarians and principals and between those of librarians and teachers. Table 2 shows that librarians regarded this task more highly than did either principals or teachers, with a mean of 4.22 compared to 3.66 and 3.60 respectively. The difference in means as shown by the value of t was 3.38 between librarians and principals, and 3.59 between librarians

and teachers (Table 7), both of which are significant at the .01 level. Librarians ranked this task seventeenth in importance whereas principals gave it a rank number of 36.5, and teachers placed it thirty-sixth.

In comparing expectations with actual practice a significant difference was revealed between librarians' actual performance and their ideal perceptions regarding the task. It can be seen in Table 3 that they gave less stress to this task than they felt it should receive, as shown by the mean of 3.46 for actual practice compared to 4.22 for ideal perceptions. The value of t between actual and ideal practice as seen by librarians was 4.60 which exceeds the required .01 level of significance (Table 8). Librarians actually gave this task a rank number of 24.5 while, ideally, they placed it twenty-seventh.

Neither principals nor teachers agreed with librarians in their opinions regarding the guidance function of the librarian, and, although principals and teachers approved of current practice, librarians did not meet their own ideals in this respect.

Task 19. Guide students in their choice of books and other materials for recreational use.

Significant differences in expectations were found between librarians and teachers only in regard to this task. Librarians, with a mean of 4.44 attached a greater degree of obligation to this task than did teachers, with a mean

of 4.05 (Table 2). The value of t between these two groups was 2.91, as shown in Table 7, which is significant at the .01 level. Librarians ranked this task twentieth in importance whereas teachers placed it twenty-fourth (Table 3).

Actual practice regarding this task differed significantly from the expectations of only one group, the librarians, as shown by a mean of 3.84 for actual practice compared to 4.44 for their ideal perceptions. The value of t between librarians' actual performance and their ideals was 3.80, which is shown by Table 8 to be significant at the .01 level. However, both in actual practice and ideally, librarians ranked this task twentieth among the tasks.

Teachers and librarians disagreed regarding the importance of the reading guidance function in recreational reading, and the performance of librarians did not meet their own ideals in this respect.

Task 22. Conduct in-service training programs with teachers in library utilization.

Significant differences of opinion appeared between principals and teachers concerning this task. Principals, with a mean of 4.11, felt it to be more important than did teachers, with a mean of 3.75 (Table 2). The obtained t between these two groups was 2.83 which Table 7 shows to be significant at the .01 level. Principals gave this task a rank number of 23.5, while teachers ranked it thirty-first.

Significant differences were revealed between actual practice and the expectations of all three groups. Table 3

shows that in actual practice, where the mean was 2.36, it received less stress than was ideally accorded it by librarians, with a mean of 4.02, by principals, with a mean of 4.11, or by teachers, with a mean of 3.75. The values of t were 8.12 between actual practice and the ideal perceptions of librarians, 9.50 between actual practice and the expectations of principals, and 9.29 between actual practice and the expectations of teachers. All these values greatly exceed that required for significance at the .01 level (Table 8). This task was actually ranked fiftieth, while, ideally, librarians ranked it thirty-third, principals gave it a rank number of 23.5, and teachers placed it thirty-first among the tasks.

Principals and teachers disagreed on the importance of in-service training programs in library use, and librarian performance failed to meet the expectations of any group.

Task 24. Instruct students in the library skills including the use of the card catalogue, reference books and magazine indexes.

A significant difference was found to exist between the opinions of librarians and teachers regarding this task. Librarians gave it more emphasis than did teachers with a mean of 4.76 compared to 4.43 (Table 2). The obtained t between these two groups was 2.79 which Table 7 shows to be significant at the .01 level. Librarians ranked this task fifth in importance while teachers placed it seventh.

No significant differences were found between group expectations and actual practice for this task.

Librarians and teachers disagreed on the importance of instruction in library skills, but all groups were satisfied with current practice.

Task 27. Guide students in the development of critical judgment in their reading, viewing and listening.

A significant difference appeared between the ideal perceptions of librarians and teachers concerning this task. Librarians, with a mean of 3.94, attributed greater importance to this task than did teachers, with a mean of 3.34 (Table 2). The value of t between these two groups was 3.61 (Table 7) which is significant at the .01 level. Librarians ranked this task thirty-fourth while teachers put it in forty-first place.

In a comparison of actual practice with expectations, significant differences were found between two pairs of groups. This task, with a mean of 2.96, was actually given less importance than either librarians, with a mean of 3.94, or principals, with a mean of 3.75, would have had it receive (Table 3). The obtained values of t were 5.77 between librarians' performance and their ideals, and 4.56 between actual practice and the expectations of principals. Table 8 shows that these figures are both well beyond the required .01 level of significance. This task was ranked forty-second in actual practice, while in ideal terms librarians ranked it thirty-fourth in importance and principals placed it

thirty-third.

Librarians and teachers disagreed about the librarian's task of fostering the development of critical judgment, and current practice in this regard did not meet the ideals of librarians or principals.

Task 29. Work with teachers in the planning of instructional units to foster optimum use of available materials and integration of library skills with classroom work.

Significant differences appeared between the opinions of librarians and teachers and between those of teachers and principals regarding this task. Both librarians, with a mean of 4.72, and principals, with a mean of 4.54, stressed this task more than did teachers, whose mean was 4.06 (Table 2). The values of t were 5.72 between librarians and teachers, and 3.25 between principals and teachers. Table 7 shows that these figures are both significant beyond the .01 level. Librarians gave this task a rank number of 6.5 and principals placed it thirteenth in importance whereas teachers ranked it in twenty-third place.

In comparing expectations with actual practice, significant differences were revealed in all three cases. In actual practice, where the mean was 3.42, this task received less stress than librarians, with a mean of 4.72, principals, with a mean of 4.45, or teachers, with a mean of 4.06, ideally assigned to it (Table 3). The obtained values of t were 8.29 between actual practice and librarians'

ideals, 6.25 between actual practice and principals' expectations, and 4.49 between actual practice and teachers' expectations. Table 8 shows all these differences to be well in excess of the .01 level of significance. Actually this task was ranked in forty-second place while in ideal terms librarians gave it a rank number of 6.5, principals placed it thirteenth, and teachers placed it twenty-third among the tasks.

Disagreement occurred between librarians and teachers and between principals and teachers regarding the librarian's part in planning for instruction, while current practice failed to meet the expectations of any group in this respect.

Task 30. Instruct students in the study skills such as scanning, summarizing, notemaking and outlining.

No significant differences were found in the ideal perceptions of the three groups regarding this task.

In a comparison of expectations with actual practice, this task was actually given significantly less importance than librarians or principals assigned to it in ideal terms. However, as shown by the means of 2.18 compared to 2.96 and 2.89 respectively, all groups placed it on the negative side of the scale (Table 3). The values of t were 3.84 between actual practice and librarians' ideal perceptions, and 3.45 between actual practice and principals' expectations. It can be seen from Table 7 that both these differences are

significant at the .01 level. In actual practice it was given a rank number of 52.5 while, ideally, librarians placed it forty-sixth and principals ranked it forty-fifth in importance.

Although no disagreement existed in the opinions of the various groups regarding instruction in the study skills, neither librarians nor principals agreed with current practice in this matter.

Task 32. Serve as resource person in the classroom when instructional units involve the library.

No significant differences were revealed between the opinions of the various groups in respect to this task.

Actual practice, however, was found to differ significantly from the expectations of all three groups. This task, with a mean of 2.60 for actual practice, was given less stress than librarians, principals or teachers, with respective means of 4.06, 3.88 and 3.78, would have had it receive (Table 3). The obtained t was 6.47 between actual practice and librarians' ideals, 5.90 between actual practice and principals' ideals, and 6.73 between actual practice and teachers' ideals. Table 8 shows that these differences are all well beyond the .01 level of significance. In actual practice this task was ranked forty-seventh while, ideally, librarians placed it thirty-second, principals placed it thirty-first, and teachers gave it a rank number of 29.5.

Although all groups were in agreement in their opinions regarding the possible librarian's task of serving as a resource person in the classroom, none of the group expectations in this regard were fulfilled by current practice.

Task 34. Guide students in their choice of materials for research.

Librarians and teachers were found to be significantly different in their opinions regarding the degree of obligation associated with this task. Librarians, with a mean of 4.52 emphasized it more than did teachers, with a mean of 4.18 (Table 2). The value of t between these two groups was 2.84 which is significant at the .01 level (Table 7). Librarians ranked it thirteenth, while teachers placed it twentieth among the tasks.

No significant differences were revealed between actual practice and group expectations for this task.

Disagreement was found to exist between the opinions of librarians and teachers in respect to guiding students in their choice of materials for research, but all three groups approved of current practice in this respect.

Task 35. Provide group reading guidance through book talks, group discussions, story-telling and other enrichment and motivational activities.

A significant difference in opinion was found between librarians and teachers regarding this task. Table 2 shows

that librarians, with a mean of 4.30, attached greater importance to this task than did teachers, with a mean of 3.82. The value of t shown in Table 7, was 3.03 which exceeds the .01 level of significance. Librarians gave it a rank number of 23.5 while teachers ranked it twenty-seventh.

Actual practice differed significantly from the expectations of all three groups. The mean of 3.08, for actual practice compared to 4.30 for the expectations of librarians, 3.96 for those of principals, and 3.82 for those of teachers indicate that this task received less emphasis than was desired by all groups (Table 3). The obtained values of t were 5.29 between actual practice and librarians' ideal perceptions, 3.79 between actual practice and the expectations of principals, and 3.82 between actual practice and those of teachers. Table 8 shows that all of these differences are beyond the required .01 level of significance. In actual practice this task was given a rank number of 38.5 compared to the ideal rankings of 23.5 by librarians, 26.5 by principals, and 27 by teachers.

Task 42. Locate information for students.

In a comparison of the ideal perceptions regarding this task, a significant difference was found between librarians and principals. Librarians, with a mean of 3.72 stressed it more than did principals, with a mean of 2.95 (Table 2). Librarians ranked it thirty-sixth while principals placed it forty-fourth in importance. The t value of 3.54

between these two groups, as shown on Table 7, is significant at the .01 level.

A significant difference was revealed between actual performance and the expectations of principals and teachers for this task, as shown by a mean of 3.92 compared to 2.95 and 3.30 respectively (Table 2). The difference in means as revealed by the value of t was 5.09 between actual practice and principals' expectations and 3.48 between actual practice and teachers' expectations. Table 8 shows these differences to be significant at the .01 level. This task was actually given a rank number of 15.5 compared to forty-four by principals and forty-two by teachers.

Disagreement existed between the opinions of librarians and principals in regard to locating information for students, and neither principals nor teachers agreed with actual practice in this respect.

Task 46. Assist students to gain skill in the inquiry technique by providing the materials, facilities and climate necessary to this type of learning.

Significant differences were revealed between the ideal perceptions of librarians and teachers regarding this task. Librarians, with a mean of 4.58 placed more importance on this duty than did teachers, with a mean of 4.16 (Table 2). The value of t obtained between these two groups was 3.21 which, as shown in Table 7, is significant at the .01 level. Librarians gave it a rank number of 11.5 whereas teachers ranked it twenty-first.

Actual practice was found to differ significantly from the expectations of librarians only. Librarians emphasized it less in actual practice, where the mean was 4.14, than they felt it should be emphasized, with a mean of 4.58 (Table 3). The value of t between librarians' actual performance and their ideal perceptions of this task was 3.28, which Table 8 shows to be significant at the .01 level. In actual practice it was ranked fourteenth while, ideally, librarians gave it a rank number of 11.5.

Librarians and teachers were found to disagree about the importance of group reading guidance, and in actual practice librarians did not meet their own expectations in this matter.

Task 47. Integrate group and individual instruction in library skills with classroom work.

In a comparison of ideal perceptions regarding this task, only those of librarians and teachers were significantly different. Table 2 shows that librarians, with a mean of 4.26 placed greater emphasis on this task than did teachers, with a mean of 3.69. The value of t between these two groups was 3.83, which is significant at the .01 level (Table 7). Librarians gave this task a rank number of 25.5 compared to 33.5 by teachers.

The expectations of all three groups were found to be significantly different from actual practice. The mean of 3.12 for actual practice compared to 4.26 for the expectations of librarians, 4.02 for the expectations of

principals, and 3.69 for those of teachers indicates that this task received less stress than all three groups desired it to receive (Table 3). The values of t were 5.49 between actual practice and librarians' ideal perceptions, 4.29 between actual practice and the expectations of principals, and 3.40 between actual practice and those of teachers. Table 8 shows that these differences all exceed the .01 level of significance. In actual practice this task was ranked thirty-sixth while, ideally, librarians gave it a rank number of 25.5, principals placed it twenty-fifth, and teachers gave it a number of 33.5.

Disagreement arose between librarians and teachers regarding the integration of library instruction with class work, and none of the groups were in agreement with current practice in this respect.

Task 55. Provide teachers with information concerning students' abilities and skills as revealed in library use.

The opinions of librarians and teachers were significantly different in regard to this task. Librarians, with a mean of 3.84 felt it to be more important than did teachers, with a mean of 3.40 (Table 2). The obtained t between these two groups was 2.66 which Table 7 shows to be significant at the .01 level. Librarians ranked it thirty-fifty while teachers placed it fortieth among the tasks.

A significant difference was revealed between actual performance and the ideal perceptions of librarians regarding

this task. Table 3 shows that in actual practice, where the mean was 3.04, it was given less stress than librarians, with a mean of 3.84, felt that it should receive. The obtained value of t between librarians' actual performance and their ideal perceptions was 3.95, which can be seen in Table 8 to be significant at the .01 level. It was ranked forty-first according to actual practice while, in ideal terms, librarians placed it thirty-fifth in importance.

Librarians and teachers disagreed regarding the possible librarian's task of providing teachers with information about students, and librarians did not meet their own expectations in this matter.

Educational tasks for which no difference existed.

In only one of the twenty-one educational tasks, Task 10, were no significant differences revealed either in the ideal perceptions of the various groups regarding that task or between actual practice and these group expectations.

Task 10 is: Orient new students in the use of the library.

Technical Tasks

The technical tasks for which significant differences were revealed between group expectations are shown in Table 2. Table 3 shows those technical tasks for which actual practice differed significantly from the expectations of the various groups. Table 9 shows the obtained values of t for those technical tasks in which group expectations

TABLE 9

Technical Tasks for Which Ideal Perceptions Differed
between Groups at the .01 Level of Significance

Task	Librarians and Principals		Librarians and Teachers		Principals and Teachers	
	Obtained	Welch Proba- bility	Obtained	Proba- bility	Obtained	Welch Proba- bility
4			3.45	<.001		N.R.
11			4.06	<.001		N.R.
21			2.86	<.001		N.R.

differed significantly, and Table 10 gives the t values for those tasks in which group expectations were significantly different from actual practice. The frequency distributions of responses for these tasks are found in Appendix C.

Six of the fifty-five librarian's tasks fall into the category of technical tasks. In comparing the ideal perceptions of the three groups, no significant differences were found between those of librarians and principals or between those of principals and teachers. However, significant differences were found between the expectations of librarians and teachers regarding three of the six tasks.

In a comparison of ideal perceptions with actual practice, a significant difference was revealed between librarians' ideals and actual practice in regard to one task. Principals' expectations were found to differ significantly from actual practice in two of the six tasks, while the expectations of teachers differed from actual practice in four of the tasks.

In two of the six technical tasks no significant differences were found either between the group expectations or between actual practice and the various group opinions.

Task 4. Catalogue books and other materials (i.e. prepare entries for the catalogue according to an accepted set of catalogue rules).

A significant difference in opinion regarding this task arose between librarians and teachers. Librarians

TABLE 10
Technical Tasks for Which Ideal Perceptions Differed from
Actual Practice at the .01 Level of Significance

Task	Librarians (Actual) and Librarians (Ideal)		Librarians (Actual) and Principals (Ideal)		Librarians (Actual) and Teachers (Ideal)		Welch Probability
	Obtained	Proba- bility	Obtained	Proba- bility	Obtained	Proba- bility	
4					4.36	<.001	N.R.
11					4.47	<.001	<.001
21			2.97	.003	4.04	<.001	N.R.
36	5.53	<.001	3.38	<.001	4.56	<.001	N.R.

N.R.: Welch Test not required.

associated a lesser degree of obligation with it than did teachers, as shown by a mean of 3.52 compared to 4.26 (Table 2). The obtained t between these two groups was 3.45, which Table 9 shows to be significant beyond the .01 level. Librarians ranked this task forty-first in importance while teachers assigned it a rank number of 14.5

The expectations of only one group, the teachers, were found to differ significantly from actual practice in respect to this task. Table 3 shows a mean of 3.30 for actual practice compared to 4.26 for the expectations of teachers. These figures indicate that teachers felt this task to deserve greater emphasis than it actually received. The value of t between teachers' expectations and actual practice was 4.36. As shown in Table 10, this value is significant at the .01 level. In actual practice the task was ranked thirtieth among the tasks while teachers gave it a rank number of 14.5.

Disagreement occurred between teachers and both the actual performance and the ideal perceptions of librarians regarding the task of cataloguing books and materials.

Task 11. Classify books and other materials (i. e. categorize them according to content by assigning a Dewey Decimal Classification number).

A significant difference was found between the opinions of librarians and teachers regarding this task. Librarians, with a mean of 3.42, placed less importance on this task than did teachers, with a mean of 4.25 (Table 2).

The value of t between these two groups was 4.06 which Table 9 shows to be significant well beyond the .01 level. Librarians ranked it in forty-third place while teachers ranked it sixteenth in order of importance.

The expectations of teachers were found to differ significantly from actual practice in regard to this task. Table 3 shows a mean of 3.28 for actual practice compared to 4.25 for teachers' expectations. The obtained value of t was 4.47 between actual practice and teachers' opinions, as shown in Table 10. This difference exceeds the required .01 level of significance. In actual practice this task was given a rank number of 31.5 while teachers placed it sixteenth among the tasks.

Teachers were found to disagree with both the opinions and the actual performance of librarians in regard to classifying books and materials.

Task 21. Organize audio-visual equipment and oversee its use.

In a comparison of ideal perceptions regarding this task the opinions of librarians were found to be significantly different from those of teachers. Librarians, with a mean of 3.70, placed greater obligation on this task than did teachers, with a mean of 3.14 (Table 2). The value of t between these two groups was 2.86 which, as Table 9 shows, is significant at the .01 level. Librarians gave this task a rank number of 37.5 while teachers placed it forty-fifth among the tasks.

The ideal perceptions of principals and teachers both differed significantly from actual practice in regard to this task. Table 3 shows that in actual practice librarians, with a mean of 3.92, placed greater stress on this task than did principals, with a mean of 3.27, or teachers, with a mean of 3.14. The obtained values of t were 2.97 between actual practice and the expectations of principals, and 4.04 between actual practice and those of teachers. Table 10 shows both these differences to be beyond the required .01 level of significance. According to actual practice it was given a rank number of 15.5 whereas principals ranked it forty-second and teachers placed it forty-fifth in importance.

Teachers were found to disagree with librarians in their opinions regarding the responsibility for audio-visual equipment while both principals and teachers were found to disagree with current practice in this respect.

Task 36. Assist teachers in the production of materials.

No significant differences were found to exist between the ideal perceptions of the various groups in respect to this task.

Significant differences were revealed, however, between actual practice and the expectations of all three groups. Table 3 shows that this task was given less stress in actual practice, where the mean was 2.48, than librarians, principals and teachers, with respective means of 3.46, 3.09

and 314., felt that it should receive. Table 10 shows an obtained t value of 5.53 between actual practice and the expectations of librarians, and 3.38 and 4.56 between actual practice and those of principals and teachers respectively. All of these values are significant at the .01 level. In actual practice this task was ranked forty-eighth while, ideally, librarians placed it forty-second, and both principals and teachers ranked it forty-third.

While all groups agreed regarding the degree of obligation which should be associated with assisting teachers to produce materials, disagreement existed between current practice and the opinions of all groups in this respect.

Technical tasks for which no differences existed.

In two out of the six technical tasks no significant differences were revealed either between the ideal perceptions of the various groups or between these ideal perceptions and actual practice. These tasks were Task 39 and Task 40.

Task 39 is: Organize and oversee the processing (i.e. preparation for use) of books and other materials.

Task 40 is: Weed the collection periodically and discard obsolete or unnecessary materials.

Non-Professional Tasks

A category of non-professional tasks which authorities state should be performed by someone other than the librarian has been included in this study. Many authors assert that librarians do in fact perform these tasks which could be

fulfilled by a clerk, aide, or monitor. Nine such tasks, which require none of the librarian's professional skills or training, were included among the fifty-five tasks of this study in order to determine whether school librarians in Alberta do in fact perform them and whether or not teachers and principals expect them to do so. Eight of these tasks could be fulfilled by a clerk or aide. The ninth, Task 51, might require the services of a teacher but has no need for the library and is not considered by authorities to be an appropriate task for the school librarian.

Those non-professional tasks for which significant differences of opinion occurred between groups are shown in Table 2. Table 3 shows those in which expectations differed significantly from actual practice. Table 11 gives the values of t for those tasks in which the ideal perceptions differed significantly, and Table 12 shows the t values for the tasks in which actual practice was significantly different from expectations. The frequency distributions of responses may be found in Appendix C.

In a comparison of the expectations of the three groups regarding the non-professional tasks, no significant difference appeared between librarians and principals for any task. However, significant differences were found between librarians and teachers on six of the nine tasks and between principals and teachers on eight of the nine possible tasks.

In the comparison of ideal perceptions with actual practice, significant differences appeared between librarians'

TABLE 11

Non-Professional Tasks for Which Ideal Perceptions Differed
between Groups at the .01 Level of Significance

Task	Librarians and Principals		Librarians and Teachers		Principals and Teachers	
	Obtained	Welch Proba- bility	Obtained	Welch Proba- bility	Obtained	Welch Proba- bility
6			3.72	<.001	2.84	.005
16			5.65	<.001	4.26	<.001
18			3.93	<.001	4.05	<.001
25			4.07	<.001	3.67	<.001
31			3.20	.001	4.02	<.001
38			4.90	<.001	4.39	<.001
50					2.82	.005
54					2.66	.009

N.R.: Welch Test not required.

TABLE 12

Non-Professional Tasks for Which Ideal Perceptions Differed from Actual Practice at the .01 Level of Significance

Task	Librarians (Actual) and Librarians (Ideal)		Librarians (Actual) and Principals (Ideal)		Librarians (Actual) and Teachers (Ideal)		Welch Probability
	Obtained t	Proba-bility	Obtained t	Proba-bility	Obtained t	Proba-bility	
6	4.39	<.001	N.R.	3.54	<.001	N.R.	
16	2.82	.006	N.R.				
18	4.60	<.001	N.R.	4.71	<.001	N.R.	
25	3.32	<.001	N.R.	3.08	.003	N.R.	
31	3.61	<.001	N.R.	4.61	<.001	<.001	
38	4.11	<.001	<.001	3.57	<.001	N.R.	
50				2.91	.004	N.R.	
51	5.71	<.001	N.R.	7.41	<.001	<.001	N.R.
54				2.98	.004	N.R.	

N.R.: Welch Test not required.

actual performance and their ideals on seven of the nine tasks. Between actual practice and principals' expectations, significant differences occurred in eight of the nine tasks. However, between actual practice and teachers' expectations, a significant difference was revealed in only one of the nine non-professional tasks.

In all of the non-professional tasks some significant differences were found either between the expectations of the various groups or between these expectations and actual practice.

Task 6. Stamp books in and out at the circulation desk.

In a comparison of ideal perceptions regarding this task, significant differences were found between those of librarians and teachers, and between those of principals and teachers. Table 2 shows that teachers, with a mean of 2.90 felt more obligation to be associated with this task than did either librarians, with a mean of 2.18, or principals, with a mean of 2.38. The values of t were 3.72 between librarians and teachers and 2.83 between principals and teachers. Table 11 shows that both these differences are significant at the .01 level. However, teachers ranked this task forty-eighth while both librarians and principals placed it forty-ninth.

In a comparison of actual practice with ideal perceptions, significant differences were found between

actual practice and the expectations of both librarians and principals. It can be seen in Table 3 that this task was actually performed more by librarians, with a mean of 3.18, than librarians or principals, with respective means of 2.18 and 2.38, felt that it should be performed. Table 12 shows the obtained values of t to be 4.39 between librarians' actual performance and their ideal perceptions, and 3.54 between actual practice and the expectations of principals. Both of these differences exceed the .01 level of significance. According to actual practice this task was given a rank number of 38.5 while, ideally, both librarians and principals ranked it in forty-ninth place.

Disagreement arose between teachers and both librarians and principals regarding the librarian's stamping of books, and both librarians and principals disagreed with current practice in this regard.

Task 16. Type catalogue cards and book pockets.

Significant differences were revealed between the ideal perceptions of librarians and teachers and between those of principals and teachers regarding this task. Table 2 shows that teachers, with a mean of 2.69 placed more importance on this task than did either librarians or principals, with respective means of 1.52 and 1.84. The values of t were 5.65 between librarians and teachers and 4.26 between principals and teachers. It can be seen from Table 11 that both of these differences are significant at

the .01 level. The marked difference in standard deviations, .96 for librarians compared to 1.52 for principals and 1.31 for teachers indicate that greater agreement existed within the librarian group than within the principal or teacher groups. Teachers ranked the task forty-eighth in importance while librarians placed it fifty-fourth, and principals ranked it fifty-second.

A significant difference was found to exist between actual practice and the ideal perceptions of librarians regarding this task. A mean of 2.18 for actual practice compared to 1.52 for their ideal perceptions indicates that librarians performed this task to a greater degree than they felt they ought to perform it. The value of t between librarians' actual performance and their ideals was 2.82 which, as Table 12 shows, is significant at the .01 level. Librarians gave this task a rank number of 52.5 in actual practice while, ideally, they ranked it in fifty-fourth place.

Teachers disagreed with both librarians and principals regarding the possible task of typing catalogue cards, and actual practice in this matter was not in accordance with the ideal perceptions of librarians.

Task 18. Return books to the shelves after circulation.

Significant differences were found to exist between the opinions of teachers and both librarians and principals

in regard to this task. Teachers, with a mean of 2.67, placed greater obligation on this duty than did either librarians, with a mean of 1.90, or principals, with a mean of 1.91 (Table 2). The obtained value of t was 3.93 between librarians and teachers and 4.05 between principals and teachers. Teachers ranked the task fiftieth while both librarians and principals placed it fifty-first.

The ideal perceptions of both librarians and principals were found to differ significantly from actual practice concerning this task. Table 3 shows that it was performed by librarians more often in actual practice, where the mean was 2.94, than either librarians or principals, with means of 1.90 and 1.91 respectively, desired. The value of t was found to be 4.60 between actual librarian performance and their ideal perceptions, and 4.71 between actual practice and principals' expectations. Table 12 shows both of these differences to be well beyond the .01 level of significance. In actual practice the task was ranked forty-third while, ideally, both librarians and principals placed it fifty-first.

Teachers disagreed with both librarians and principals regarding the task of shelving books, and librarians and principals both disagreed with current practice in this matter.

Task 25. Write notices to students for overdue books.

The opinions of teachers were found to differ significantly from those of both librarians and principals

in respect to this task. Teachers, with a mean of 3.03 placed more importance on this task than did librarians or principals, with respective means of 2.16 and 2.32 (Table 2). The values of t were 4.07 between librarians and teachers and 3.67 between principals and teachers, both of which exceed the .01 level of significance (Table 11). Teachers ranked this task forty-seventh while both librarians and principals placed it fiftieth.

The expectations of librarians and principals were both found to be significantly different from actual practice for this task. A mean of 3.08 for actual practice compared to 2.16 for the expectations of librarians, and 2.32 for those of principals, indicates that librarians fulfilled this task to a greater degree than they or the principals felt that they should perform it (Table 3). The obtained t was 3.32 between actual practice and the ideal perceptions of librarians and 3.09 between actual practice and the expectations of principals. Table 12 shows that both these differences are significant at the .01 level. In actual practice this task was given a rank number of 38.5, while, in ideal terms, librarians and principals both placed it fiftieth among the tasks.

Disagreement occurred between teachers and both librarians and principals about the writing of overdue notices, and neither librarians nor principals approved of current practice.

Task 31. Repair worn books and put plastic covers on new ones.

The opinions of teachers were found to differ significantly from those of librarians and principals in respect to this task. Table 3 shows that teachers, with a mean of 2.58, placed more importance on this task than did librarians, with a mean of 1.86, or principals, with a mean of 1.70. The obtained values of t were 3.20 between librarians and teachers and 4.02 between principals and teachers, both of which are significant at the .01 level (Table 11). Teachers gave it a rank number of 51.5 while librarians placed it fifty-second and principals ranked it fifty-third.

In actual practice this task was given significantly greater stress than either librarians or principals would have had it receive, as shown by the mean of 2.86 compared to 1.86 and 1.79 respectively (Table 2). The values of t were 3.61 between librarians' actual performance and their ideals, and 4.61 between actual practice and principals' expectations. Table 12 shows that both these differences are well beyond the required .01 level of significance. The standard deviations of 1.44 for librarians in actual practice and 1.30 for librarians and .90 for principals in their ideal perceptions indicate that greater consensus existed among principals than among librarians in actual practice or according to their ideal perceptions of this task. According to actual practice this task was ranked forty-fourth,

whereas librarians placed it fifty-second, and principals ranked it fifty-third in order of importance.

Librarians and principals were both found to disagree with teachers as well as with current practice in respect to repairing and covering books.

Task 38. Paste book pockets in books.

Significant differences were revealed here between the opinions of teachers and librarians and between those of teachers and principals. Table 2 shows that teachers, with a mean of 2.41 placed more importance on this task than did either librarians or principals, with respective means of 1.44 and 1.55. The value of t between librarians and teachers was 4.90 and between principals and teachers it was 4.39. Table 11 shows both these differences to be significant at the .01 level. The standard deviation of .88 for librarians compared to 1.27 for teachers indicates that librarians were more in agreement among themselves than were teachers regarding this task. Teachers ranked this task fifty-fourth, librarians ranked it fifty-fifth, and principals gave it a rank number of 54.5.

Significant differences were found between actual practice and the expectations of both librarians and principals for this task. Table 3 shows that more importance was actually placed on this task, with a mean of 2.38, than either librarians, with a mean of 1.44, or principals, with a mean of 1.55, desired it to receive. The values of t were 4.11 between librarians' actual performance and their ideals,

and 3.57 between actual practice and the expectations of principals. It can be seen from Table 12 that both of these differences exceed the .01 level of significance. The standard deviation of .88 for librarians according to their opinions, compared to 1.34 for librarians according to actual practice (Table 3) indicates that more agreement existed among the librarians in their ideal perceptions of this task than in their actual performance of it. Table 3 also shows that this task was actually ranked forty-ninth while, ideally, librarians placed it fifty-fifth and principals gave it a rank number of 54.5.

Task 50. Clip and mount materials for the pamphlet file.

Significant differences were found between the opinions of principals and teachers regarding this task. Teachers, with a mean of 3.07, placed greater emphasis on this task than did principals whose mean was 2.55 (Table 2). The value of t between these two groups was 2.82 which Table 11 shows to be significant at the .01 level. Teachers ranked this task forty-sixth while principals placed it forty-eighth in importance.

A significant difference was revealed between actual practice and principals only for this task. Table 3 shows that it was actually accorded greater importance, with a mean of 3.22, than principals, with a mean of 2.55, believed that it should receive. The value of t was 2.91 between principals' expectations and actual practice, which can be

seen in Table 12 to be significant at the .01 level. This task was actually ranked thirty-fourth while principals ranked it forty-eighth among the tasks.

Principals were found to disagree with teachers and with actual practice regarding the preparation of materials for the pamphlet file.

Task 51. Accommodate and supervise students taking a spare and doing work which does not require the library's resources.

No significant differences occurred between the expectations of any of the three groups concerning this task.

Actual practice, however, was found to be significantly different from the ideal perceptions of all three groups for this task. Table 3 shows that in actual practice, where the mean was 3.14, this task was performed to a greater degree than librarians, with a mean of 1.76, principals, with a mean of 1.55, or teachers, with a mean of 1.71, felt that it should be performed. Table 12 shows the obtained values of t to be 5.71 between librarians' actual performance and their ideals, 7.41 between actual practice and principals' expectations, and 7.52 between actual practice and the expectations of teachers. These differences all far exceed the required .01 level of significance. The standard deviations of 1.31 for librarians in actual practice, 1.07, .84 and 1.02 for librarians, principals and teachers respectively according to their opinions show a marked

disparity. There was much less consensus among librarians in actual practice than among the principals, who were more in agreement among themselves than were any other group. In actual practice this task was ranked thirty-fifth in importance while in ideal terms librarians placed it fifty-third, principals gave it a rank number of 54.5 and teachers ranked it fifty-fourth.

Though agreement existed among all the groups regarding the supervision of students doing work unrelated to the library, none of the groups approved of current practice in this respect.

Task 54. Check the shelves to see that books are in the correct order.

A significant difference was found between the ideal perceptions of principals and those of teachers regarding this task. Table 2 shows that teachers, with a mean of 3.17, placed a greater degree of obligation on this task than did principals, with a mean of 2.64. The value of t between these two groups was 2.66, which Table 11 shows to be significant at the .01 level. Teachers ranked it forty-fourth while principals ranked it in forty-seventh place.

The expectations of only one group, the principals, differed significantly from actual practice concerning this task. Table 3 shows that it was actually given more emphasis, with a mean of 3.34, than principals, with a mean

of 2.64, felt it should receive. The value of t between actual practice and the expectations of principals was 2.98 which Table 12 shows to be significant at the .01 level. This task was actually given a rank number of 28.5 whereas principals ranked it ideally in forty-seventh place.

SUMMARY

When the rank ordering of the fifty-five possible school librarians' tasks by the librarians and their two major referent groups was analyzed for over-all consensus in opinion, significantly high correlations were found among all groups. These correlations indicated general agreement on the relative importance of the tasks among all groups. The correlations of the rank-orderings of the position groups with the rank-ordering according to actual practice were lower than those between the various group opinions but were still well above the level required for significance (Table 4, p. 66). Thus general agreement on the relative importance of the tasks was indicated among the groups and between group opinions and actual practice. According to this criterion, then, none of the six null hypotheses could be rejected. However, since no perfect positive correlations were found to exist, these hypotheses were further tested in terms of individual tasks.

Table 13 shows the number of individual task differences which were revealed between the various groups.

TABLE 13

Number of Tasks in Which There Were Significant Differences
between Groups by the t Test, at the .01 Level

	Librarians (Ideal)	Principals	Teachers	Librarians (Actual)
Librarians (Ideal)		4	26	35
Principals	4		13	36
Teachers	26	13		27
Librarians (Actual)	35	36	27	

TABLE 14

Number of Tasks, by Category, in Which Significant Differences
Were Revealed between Groups by the t Test, at the .01 Level

Groups Compared	Admini- strative (18)	Edu- cational (22)	Technical (6)	Non-Pro- fessional (9)
Librarians (Ideal) and Principals	2	2	0	0
Librarians (Ideal) and Teachers	4	13	3	6
Principals and Teachers	3	2	0	8
Librarians (Actual) and Librarians (Ideal)	9	18	1	7
Librarians (Actual) and Principals	11	15	2	8
Librarians (Actual) and Teachers	10	12	4	1

Table 14 identifies the categories of possible librarian performance in which significant differences among the various groups were found.

When the ideal perceptions of the librarian's tasks held by the three groups were compared, librarians and principals were found to differ significantly on only four of the fifty-five tasks. Two of these tasks were administrative and two were educational. Librarians and teachers held divergent views regarding twenty-six of the tasks. Four of these tasks were administrative, thirteen were educational, three were technical, and six were non-professional. Principals and teachers held significantly different opinions about thirteen of the fifty-five tasks. Three of these differences occurred on administrative tasks, two on educational, none on technical and eight on non-professional tasks.

In the comparison of actual practice with the various group opinions, the views of librarians were found to differ significantly from their actual performance on thirty-five of the fifty-five tasks. Nine of these tasks were administrative, eighteen were educational, one was technical and seven were non-professional. Principals' opinions were also significantly different from actual practice in regard to thirty-six tasks. Eleven of these tasks were administrative, fifteen were educational, two were technical, and eight were non-professional. The expectations of teachers were found to differ significantly

from actual practice on twenty-seven of the fifty-five tasks. Ten of these tasks were administrative, twelve were educational, four were technical, and one was non-professional.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The analysis of the data in the previous chapter contained some findings pertinent to the role of the school librarian and to those vitally concerned with this position. In reviewing these findings attention was given to the tasks in which divergent expectations were found to exist among the librarian and his two major referent groups. Those tasks in which the expectations of the various groups differed significantly from current practice were also considered. This chapter summarizes briefly the purpose, design, and conduct of the study and discusses the general findings and their implications for the role of the school librarian.

Purpose of the Study

This study investigated the perceptions of possible tasks of the school librarian held by librarians, principals and teachers. It sought to identify expectation differences which existed among these position groups in Alberta schools regarding the degree of obligation associated with these tasks. It also investigated differences between the expectations held by these groups and actual practice as reported by the librarian.

Design and Conduct of the Study

A questionnaire consisting of fifty-five possible school librarian's tasks which elicited responses on a five point Likert scale was used to determine group expectations and actual practice regarding those tasks. The questionnaires were forwarded to a random selection of sixty librarians, sixty principals and 160 teachers in Alberta. Completed questionnaires were received from fifty librarians, fifty-six principals and 114 teachers.

The fifty-five statements of possible duties were formulated from three categories of appropriate librarian performance and from one category of non-professional duties which, according to many authors, are commonly performed by librarians. Respondents indicated, in one of the five response categories, the degree to which they felt each task to be mandatory. Librarians indicated, on a parallel scale, the degree to which each task was actually performed.

A frequency distribution was constructed for each task, and the mean and standard deviation were computed. The tasks were then rank ordered for each group according to the size of the mean.

All information was analyzed through four statistical tests deemed appropriate for this data. Over-all agreement according to rank orderings of the tasks was ascertained by the Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient Test. The mean of the distribution for each task was compared and tested between pairs of groups by the t test. Since the t test

assumes that the variance of the groups compared is homogeneous, an Analysis of Variance was also conducted to determine where this assumption was valid and where it was not. A Welch test was conducted for those tasks in which the variance between groups was unequal in order to substantiate or disprove the significant differences shown on the t test. On all tests differences at the .01 level of probability were noted.

Findings Relating to the Hypotheses

Information was sought in regard to the six hypotheses of the study.

Hypothesis 1. Librarians and principals view similarly the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory.

In a comparison of the rank ordering of the tasks by librarians and principals, a significantly high correlation was revealed. This correlation of .95 was the highest obtained in any of the between group comparisons. However, since it was not a perfect positive correlation, Hypothesis 1 was not accepted unconditionally, but was further tested in terms of individual tasks.

Significantly different expectations between librarians and principals were revealed for only four of the fifty-five tasks. Two of these tasks in which significant differences occurred fall in the category of administrative tasks while two are in the educational tasks category. No significant differences appeared between the two groups on any of the

technical or non-professional tasks.

Among the eighteen administrative tasks included in the study, librarians placed significantly greater emphasis on scheduling the use of the library by groups and individuals and on administering the library budget than principals placed on these tasks.

Among the educational tasks, librarians associated a greater degree of obligation with providing guidance to students and with helping them to find information than did principals.

Hypothesis 1 was therefore accepted with the expectation of the above mentioned duties, stated in Tasks 17, 42, 44 and 45.

Hypothesis 2. Librarians and teachers view similarly the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory.

When the rank orderings of the tasks by librarians and teachers were compared, a significantly high correlation was obtained. Although this correlation of .87 was the lowest of those obtained between group expectations, it was well above the level required for significance. On this basis the librarian would not find himself in marked disagreement with teachers regarding the relative importance of his tasks. However, since the positive correlation was not perfect, Hypothesis 2 was not accepted unconditionally but was tested in terms of individual tasks.

Librarians and teachers were found to differ significantly in their opinions regarding twenty-six of the fifty-five possible tasks.

Among the eighteen administrative tasks included in the study the opinions of librarians and teachers differed significantly on four. Librarians gave greater emphasis than did teachers to book evaluation and selection, to scheduling the use of the library, to administering the budget, and to planning library quarters and facilities.

Among the twenty-two educational tasks included in the study, the views of librarians and teachers differed significantly on thirteen. These educational tasks are all ones which are considered by authorities in the field to be appropriate tasks for the school librarian. Many authors state that educational tasks in general are the most important function of the school librarian.

In this study librarians consistently placed greater emphasis on all thirteen tasks in which significant differences occurred than teachers placed on them.

Librarians felt five tasks related to the reading guidance function of the school librarian to be more important than teachers felt them to be. These tasks involved guiding students in their choice of books and materials for recreation or research, keeping records of students' reading interests and ability, guiding students toward critical judgment in reading, and providing group reading guidance through book talks, discussions and other such activities.

Two activities in which the librarian works with teachers in educational planning were judged to be significantly less important by teachers than by librarians. These tasks included serving as resource consultant on curriculum committees and at department or grade meetings and working with teachers in the planning of instructional units.

Two tasks relating to instruction in library skills were viewed as significantly less important by teachers than by librarians. The task of instructing students in the library skills including the use of the card catalogue, reference books and magazine indexes, and the task of integrating this instruction with classroom work were both considered more important by librarians than they were by teachers.

Two tasks associated with guidance, that of providing personal, social, vocational and educational guidance through suitable materials, and that of providing teachers with information about students as revealed in library use were given significantly less emphasis by teachers than they were by librarians.

Two other tasks of a general educational nature were considered to merit less of the librarian's attention by teachers than they were by librarians. One of these was the preparation of bibliographies for teacher use; the other was the fostering of the inquiry technique through the provision of appropriate materials, facilities and climate.

Librarians and teachers differed significantly in

their opinions regarding three of the six technical tasks included in the study. Two of these technical tasks, classifying and cataloguing books and materials, were regarded as more important by teachers than they were by librarians. One other technical task, that of organizing and overseeing the use of audio-visual equipment, was felt by librarians to carry a greater degree of obligation than it was by teachers.

Librarians and teachers disagreed with regard to six of the nine non-professional tasks included in the study. These tasks are all of the type that authors feel should be performed by someone other than the librarian as they do not require his professional skills and training. Teachers in this study consistently associated a greater degree of obligation for the librarian with these tasks than did the librarians themselves. However, these tasks were placed relatively low on the scale by teachers even though they were placed significantly lower by librarians. The mean for teachers was on the negative side of the scale in all but one of these tasks, Task 25, and for librarians it was well on the negative side of the continuum on all tasks. This tendency would indicate that teachers generally did not judge these tasks to merit primary attention by the librarian, although librarians generally felt that they should merit very little consideration. The six non-professional tasks which teachers regarded as significantly more important than did librarians involved stamping books, typing catalogue cards

and book pockets, shelving books, writing overdue notices, and repairing books.

In view of the many differences of opinion between librarians and teachers on individual tasks, Hypothesis 2 was given only a qualified acceptance. It was rejected for the above described twenty-six tasks. These were Tasks 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 27, 29, 31, 34, 35, 38, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 and 55.

Hypothesis 3. Principals and teachers view similarly the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory.

In a comparison of the rank ordering of the tasks by principals and teachers a significantly high correlation was obtained. This correlation of .94 was the second highest among the groups compared. However, since this figure did not represent a perfect positive correlation, it was necessary to qualify the acceptance of Hypothesis 1 and test it further in terms of individual tasks.

Significant differences in expectations between principals and teachers emerged on thirteen of the fifty-five tasks. Three of the tasks in which significant differences of opinion occurred are in the category of administrative tasks, two are educational tasks, none are technical, and eight are non-professional tasks.

Among the eighteen administrative tasks included in the study, significant differences were revealed between

principals and teachers on three. Principals considered these tasks to be significantly more important than did teachers. These administrative tasks involved evaluation and selection of books, planning with the administration and staff for the integration of the library program, and publicizing and promoting the library program.

Principals and teachers held divergent opinions regarding only two of the twenty-two educational tasks. Principals associated a significantly greater degree of obligation for the librarian with both of these tasks than did teachers. Principals felt it to be more important for librarians to conduct in-service training programs with teachers and to work with teachers in the planning of instructional units than did the teachers themselves.

The opinions of principals and teachers differed significantly in regard to eight of the nine possible non-professional tasks included in the study. Principals consistently placed less importance than teachers placed on these tasks, which, according to authorities, are not appropriate tasks for the professional school librarian. These tasks, however, were placed relatively low on the scale by both groups. The mean for teachers was on the negative side of the scale for all but two of the tasks, Task 25 and 54, while that for principals was consistently negative for all eight tasks. Thus teachers did not place great importance on any of these non-professional tasks, although principals placed significantly less importance on them. These eight

non-professional tasks which were valued more highly by teachers than they were by principals involved stamping books, typing, shelving books, writing overdue notices, repairing books, pasting book pockets, clipping and mounting materials, and checking the shelves to see that books are in the correct order.

Hypothesis 3 was therefore accepted except in respect to the aforementioned tasks. For tasks 1, 6, 16, 18, 22, 25, 26, 29, 31, 33, 38, 50 and 54 it was rejected.

Hypothesis 4. The opinion which the librarian holds regarding the degree to which his possible tasks should be mandatory and the degree to which he actually performs them are similar.

In a comparison of the librarians' rank ordering of their possible tasks according to their ideal perceptions with their rank ordering according to actual practice, a significantly high correlation was found to exist. This correlation of .67 was the second lowest obtained in the comparisons between group opinions and between these opinions and actual practice. However, it was still well beyond the level required for significance. Although this positive correlation was significant, it was not perfect; therefore Hypothesis 4 was not accepted unconditionally but was tested in terms of individual tasks.

The ideal perceptions of librarians were found to differ significantly from their actual performance in respect

to thirty-five of the fifty-five tasks included in the study.

Among the eighteen administrative tasks of the study, the opinions of librarians differed significantly from actual practice on nine. Librarians placed much greater importance on these nine tasks in ideal terms than they did in actual practice. The differences in means as shown by the values of t were generally far in excess of the level required for significance at the .01 level. These tasks which librarians emphasized more in their opinions than they did in actual practice involved creating an attractive atmosphere, co-ordinating school and public library services, formulating a library policy statement, planning with the staff for the integration of the library program, promoting the library program, involving teachers in book selection, evaluating the library program and services, planning library quarters and facilities, and planning and implementing a library program. It is apparent that librarians performed these tasks to a lesser degree than they felt they should, or than they would have liked to perform them under ideal circumstances.

The opinions of librarians differed significantly from their actual performance in regard to eighteen of the twenty-two educational tasks. On all eighteen of the tasks in this category, considered by authorities to be generally important, librarians placed significantly greater importance in ideal terms than they did in actual practice.

Librarians placed significantly greater emphasis in their ideal perceptions than they did in actual practice

on five tasks relating to the reading guidance function. These tasks involved keeping records of students' reading ability and interests, developing reading lists for students, guiding students in their choice of books for recreation, guiding students towards critical judgment in their reading, and providing group reading guidance through activities such as book talks, discussions and storytelling.

Seven activities in which the librarian works with teachers were given significantly less emphasis in actual practice than they were in the opinions of librarians. Three of these tasks involved working with teachers as a resource consultant or specialist. Ideally, librarians placed greater emphasis than they did in actual practice on serving as resource consultant at curriculum, department or grade meetings, on working with teachers in the planning of instructional units, and on serving as resource person in the classroom when the library is involved. The other four teacher-related tasks which were perceived by librarians to be more important in ideal terms than they were in actual practice included keeping teachers informed of the library's resources, preparing bibliographies for teacher use, helping teachers to keep informed of educational developments, and conducting in-service training programs with teachers.

Two tasks involving instruction in library skills were seen by librarians to have significantly greater importance in ideal terms than in actual practice. These tasks involved instructing students in the study skills and integrating

instruction in library skills with classroom work.

Two tasks involving guidance, that of providing personal, social, vocational and education guidance through suitable materials, and that of providing teachers with information about students as revealed in library use were given significantly less emphasis in actual practice than in the opinions of librarians.

Two other tasks of an educational nature were ideally perceived by librarians to be significantly more important than they were in actual practice. One of these was becoming familiar with the educational program and curriculum; the other was fostering the inquiry technique through the provision of suitable materials.

Among the six technical tasks included in the study, librarians' opinions differed significantly from their actual performance on one. Ideally librarians would have given significantly greater attention to assisting teachers in the production of materials than they did in actual practice.

The opinions of librarians were found to differ significantly from their actual performance with respect to seven of the nine non-professional tasks included in the study. In the opinion of authorities in the field these are not suitable tasks for the school librarian. Although both groups placed these tasks relatively low on the scale, the mean for librarians' ideal perceptions was on the negative side for all seven tasks, while for actual practice it was negative for four tasks but slightly on the positive side

for three, Tasks 6, 25, and 51. It is evident that librarians placed very little value on these tasks in their ideal perceptions while in actual practice, though these tasks were not primarily important, they did receive some attention. These duties involved stamping books, typing, writing overdue notices, repairing books, pasting book pockets, and acting as study hall supervisor for students taking a spare in the library.

In view of the many significant differences between librarians' ideal perceptions and their actual performance on individual tasks, Hypothesis 4 was given only a qualified acceptance. In respect to Tasks 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, and 55 this hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 5. Principals' opinions regarding the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory and the degree to which they are actually performed are similar.

When the rank ordering of the tasks according to actual practice was compared with the ideal rank ordering by principals, a significantly high correlation was obtained. This correlation of .62 was the lowest of any obtained between group opinions or between actual practice and these group opinions. However, it was still well above the level required for significance at the .01 level of probability. However,

since this positive correlation was less than perfect, Hypothesis 4 was not accepted unconditionally, but was further tested in terms of individual tasks.

The opinions of principals were found to differ significantly from actual practice on thirty-six of the fifty-five tasks.

Significant differences were revealed between the opinions of principals and actual practice on eleven of the eighteen administrative tasks included in the study. On all of these tasks except one, principals placed a greater degree of importance than was accorded them in actual practice. For the ten tasks on which principals placed greater emphasis, the differences in mean as shown by the value of t greatly exceed the level required for significance at the .01 level. Principals attributed significantly greater importance than was actually assigned to the following tasks: creating an attractive atmosphere in the library, co-ordinating school and public library services, formulating a library policy statement, planning with the staff for the integration of the library program, publicizing the library program, involving teachers in book selection, evaluating the library program and services, planning library quarters and facilities, planning and implementing a library program, and overseeing the circulation of materials. In actual practice librarians devoted greater attention to the eleventh administrative task, the acquisition of books and materials, than principals felt that it merited.

Among the twenty-two educational tasks used in the study, the opinions of principals differed significantly from actual practice on fifteen. On all of these tasks but one, Task 42, principals placed significantly greater importance than was assigned to them in actual practice.

Four tasks related to reading guidance were considered by principals to merit more attention than they actually received. These tasks involved keeping records of students' reading interests and abilities, developing reading lists for students, guiding students toward critical judgment in their reading, and providing group reading guidance through activities such as book talks, storytelling and group discussions.

Seven possible tasks in which the librarian and teachers work together were considered by principals to require significantly greater stress than they were accorded in actual practice. In three of these activities the librarian serves as a resource specialist. These tasks were serving as resource consultant on curriculum committees and at department or grade meetings, working with teachers in planning instructional units, and serving as resource person in the classroom when the library is involved. The other four tasks involving work with teachers included: keeping teachers informed of the library's resources, preparing bibliographies for teacher use, helping teachers to keep informed of educational developments, and conducting in-service training programs with teachers.

Two tasks involving instruction in library skills were given greater importance in the opinions of principals than they were in actual practice. These tasks included instructing students in the study skills and integrating library skills with classroom work.

Principals also felt that the general educational task of becoming familiar with the educational program merited greater attention than it actually received.

One of the fifteen educational tasks in which a significant difference arose was given more attention by librarians in actual practice than principals felt it deserved. This task, in the area of reference services, entailed locating information for students.

Among the six technical tasks of the study, the opinions of principals were found to differ significantly from those of librarians on two. Principals attached less importance to organizing and overseeing audio-visual equipment as a task of the librarian than was actually placed on it by librarians. However, principals felt that assisting teachers in the production of materials should receive more attention than it did in actual practice.

Significant differences were revealed between the opinions of principals and current practice regarding eight of the nine non-professional tasks included in the study. Principals uniformly attributed a lesser degree of obligation for the librarian to these non-professional tasks than was actually accorded them by librarians. Though none of these

tasks was placed at the upper end of the scale according to actual practice, the mean was on the positive side for four of them. The fact that the mean for principals was on the negative side of the continuum for all these tasks indicates that they rejected these non-professional tasks as functions of the school librarian. Principals attributed significantly less importance than was actually assigned to the seven clerical tasks of the study. These duties involved stamping, shelving and repairing books, writing overdue notices, pasting book pockets, clipping and mounting materials, and checking the shelves to see that the books are in order. An eighth task was placed in this category because authorities generally believe it to be an inappropriate task for the school librarian although it would probably require the services of a teacher. This task, accommodating and supervising students taking a spare and not using the library's resources, was seen by principals to be of less importance as a task of the librarian than librarians actually accorded it.

Since the opinions of principals differed significantly from actual librarian performance on thirty-six of the fifty-five tasks, Hypothesis 5 was given only a qualified acceptance. It was rejected in respect to Tasks 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 42, 43, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52 and 54.

Hypothesis 6. Teachers' opinions regarding the degree to which possible librarian's tasks should be mandatory and the degree to which they are actually performed are similar.

In the comparison of the rank ordering of the tasks according to actual practice with the ideal rank ordering by teachers, a significantly high correlation was obtained. This correlation of .69 was the highest obtained between actual practice and group opinions. However, since this figure did not constitute a perfect positive correlation, Hypothesis 6 was not accepted unconditionally but was tested further in terms of individual tasks.

The opinions of teachers were found to be significantly different from actual practice in regard to twenty-seven of the fifty-five possible librarian's tasks.

Among the eighteen administrative tasks included in the study, significant differences between actual practice and the opinions of teachers occurred on ten. Teachers placed greater emphasis on eight of these tasks than was actually assigned to them. However, greater stress was actually given to two activities, Tasks 1 and 52, than teachers felt they should receive. The tasks upon which teachers placed greater stress than librarians actually gave them included: creating a pleasant atmosphere, co-ordinating school and public library services, formulating a library policy statement, planning with the staff for the integration of the library program, publicizing the library program, evaluating the library program and services, planning library quarters and facilities, and planning and implementing a library program. The two administrative tasks which received significantly greater emphasis in actual practice than teachers felt to be warranted

involved book evaluation and selection, and organizing and overseeing circulation.

The opinions of teachers were found to differ significantly from actual practice in regard to twelve of the twenty-two educational tasks used in the study. To eleven of these educational tasks teachers attached greater importance than librarians assigned in actual practice.

Three tasks associated with reading guidance were considered by teachers to merit more attention than librarians paid to them. These tasks included keeping records of students' reading ability and interests, developing reading lists for students, and providing group reading guidance through book talks, discussions and storytelling.

Six educational tasks which entail working with teachers were considered by teachers to be worthy of more attention than was actually given them by librarians. In three of these functions, serving as resource consultant at curriculum committee, department or grade meetings, working with teachers in the planning of instructional units, and serving as a resource person in the classroom when the library is involved, the librarian acts as a resource specialist. The other three teacher-related activities were keeping teachers informed of materials in the library, helping teachers to keep informed of educational developments, and conducting in-service training programs with teachers.

One task in the area of library instruction, that of integrating instruction in library skills with classroom work, was considered by teachers to require significantly greater emphasis than was actually placed on it by librarians.

One other task in the educational category was seen by teachers to require significantly greater stress than it actually received from librarians. This task involved becoming familiar with the curriculum and educational program of the school.

One educational task in the area of reference services, that of locating information for students, received significantly more attention in actual practice than teachers felt it deserved.

The opinions of teachers were found to differ significantly from actual practice in regard to four of the six technical tasks included in the study. Three of these tasks were considered by teachers to warrant greater emphasis than was actually accorded them. These duties involved cataloguing and classifying books and materials, and assisting teachers in the production of materials. The fourth technical task, that of organizing and overseeing audio-visual equipment, was actually given more attention by librarians than it was felt to merit by teachers.

The opinions of teachers differed significantly from actual practice on only one of the nine non-professional tasks included in the study. In regard to all of the tasks of a clerical nature teachers did not disagree markedly with

current practice. However, they felt the task of accommodating and supervising students for a spare to be of significantly less importance than was actually assigned to it by librarians.

The acceptance of Hypothesis 6 was qualified with respect to the tasks discussed above. For Tasks 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 29, 32, 33, 35, 36, 42, 43, 47, 48, 49, 51, and 52 this hypothesis was rejected.

Summary of Findings

In the examination of the over-all opinions of the librarian and his referent groups regarding his possible tasks, considerable agreement was found to exist. The views of the three groups regarding the relative importance of the fifty-five tasks were seen to be similar. Furthermore, the tasks were actually fulfilled according to a relative order of importance which largely conformed to the expectations of the three groups. Therefore the librarian would not find himself in a serious role conflict situation in regard to the relative order of importance to be accorded the various tasks.

This study, however, has revealed many significant differences in the opinions of the various groups and between actual practice and these group opinions in regard to specific tasks. When the opinions of the various groups were examined for potential role conflict, it became evident that conflicting expectations did exist between the librarian and his referent groups which would be conducive to role conflict. Role

conflict situations also occurred with respect to the manner in which the librarian actually fulfilled his role.

When the various group opinions were analyzed, significant differences were found between the librarian and at least one of the referent groups on twenty-seven of the fifty-five tasks. This tendency indicates the presence of role conflict as a result of conflicting expectations between the librarian and his referent groups. The views of librarians differed from those of principals on only four tasks while they differed from those of teachers on twenty-six. This fact indicates that librarians and principals were generally in agreement on the manner in which the librarian should fulfill his role.

Role conflict would arise between teachers and librarians, however, in respect to almost half of the possible librarian's tasks used in the study. Divergent views were expressed about four administrative tasks, thirteen educational tasks, three technical tasks and six non-professional tasks. It therefore appears that the greatest areas of potential role conflict arise in the realm of educational tasks, where teachers saw less obligation than did librarians, and of non-professional tasks, to which teachers attributed greater importance than did librarians. In the area of technical tasks some conflict arose although the differences of opinion regarding classifying and cataloguing may be partly attributable to the fact that librarians would know that in large centres

these services are performed by the central library, whereas teachers might not be aware of this fact.

Conflicting expectations between the two referent groups, teachers and principals, occurred on thirteen of the twenty-five tasks, three being administrative, two educational, and eight non-professional. In the areas of administrative, educational and technical tasks, these expectations would not indicate serious role conflict. However, since teachers placed a greater degree of obligation on eight of the nine non-professional tasks than did principals, role conflict would result in this area.

When the expectations of the three groups were compared to actual practice for the identification of areas of further role conflict, a larger number of significant differences were revealed than when group opinions were compared to one another. When ideal perceptions were compared, there were twenty-four tasks in which no significant differences of opinion were revealed between the librarians and either referent group, or between the referent groups themselves. However, in the comparison of the various group opinions with actual practice, on only eleven of the fifty-five tasks were there no significant differences found. Therefore there appears to be less likelihood of role conflict for the librarian through conflicting expectations than there is through actual practice not meeting those expectations.

When the group opinions were compared to actual practice to determine the areas where approval or disapproval of current practice existed, it was found that, in actual practice, librarians did not meet their own expectations on thirty-five tasks, those of principals on thirty-six tasks and those of teachers on twenty-seven tasks.

Librarians failed to meet their own expectations in regard to nine of the eighteen administrative tasks, eighteen out of twenty-two educational tasks, one out of six technical tasks, and seven out of nine non-professional tasks. To all of the administrative and educational tasks librarians devoted much less attention in actual practice than they deemed desirable in ideal terms. It is therefore apparent that, due to some circumstances and conditions which currently prevail, librarians are not fulfilling their administrative or educational role to the degree which they feel is desirable. In regard to the non-professional tasks of the study, librarians were found to devote significantly more attention than they deemed appropriate to all of these tasks.

The actual performance of librarians failed to meet the expectations of principals with respect to thirty-six of the fifty-five possible tasks. This situation would result in considerable role conflict for the librarian. Principals registered disapproval of current practice in regard to eleven of the eighteen administrative tasks, fifteen of the twenty-two educational tasks, two out of six

technical tasks and eight out of nine non-professional tasks. With the exception of one task in each category, the acquisition of materials and the locating of information for students, principals felt that more emphasis should be placed on the administrative and educational tasks than was actually accorded them by librarians. In the realm of non-professional tasks librarians performed all of these tasks to a greater extent than principals deemed to be desirable.

Role conflict for librarians would also result from the fact that their actual performance did not conform to the expectations of teachers in regard to twenty-seven of the tasks, ten of which were administrative, twelve educational, four technical and one non-professional. A lesser degree of dissatisfaction with the librarian's role performance, however, was evident among teachers than among principals and librarians themselves. In this respect, role conflict would therefore be somewhat less with teachers than it would be with principals. Teachers felt that most of the administrative and educational tasks on which they disapproved of actual practice merited more attention than was actually given them by librarians. They felt, however, that book acquisition and locating information for students were stressed more than was necessary. In the area of technical tasks, teachers felt that greater stress should be given to these tasks, with the exception of overseeing audio-visual equipment, than was actually given them. Teachers did not register marked disapproval of librarians' performance in regard to

non-professional tasks except for the one involving accommodation and supervision of students taking a spare in the library, which they felt to deserve less attention than it received. This approval of actual practice is in marked contrast to the disapproval expressed by both librarians and principals of the extent to which librarians actually performed clerical tasks.

On only seven of the total fifty-five tasks were there no differences of opinion or differences between opinions and actual practice. Therefore, in regard to forty-eight of the tasks used, some potential for role conflict exists.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Librarians, principals and teachers did not disagree markedly with one another nor did any group strongly disapprove of current practice in regard to the relative order of importance of the librarian's tasks.

2. Role conflict as a result of conflicting expectations would be negligible between librarians and principals, but would arise to a small degree between teachers and principals and to a considerable degree between librarians and teachers.

3. Conflicting expectations between librarians and teachers which would engender role conflict were particularly evident in the areas of educational and non-professional tasks. Teachers expressed the view that librarians should stress educational tasks less and

non-professional tasks more than librarians felt they should stress them.

4. Extensive role conflict would occur for the librarian as a result of his actual performance not meeting the expectation of either of his referent groups.

5. Librarians reported that their actual performance did not fulfill their ideal perceptions on roughly two-thirds of their tasks. It appears that conditions prevented librarians from fulfilling their role as they saw fit. Librarians were most dissatisfied with their own role performance in respect to educational tasks, which received less stress, and non-professional tasks, which received more stress than they would ideally have placed on them.

6. The actual performance of librarians failed to meet the expectations of principals on approximately two-thirds of their tasks. Extensive role conflict would therefore be generated between these two groups. Principals expressed the desire for librarians to devote more attention to administrative and educational tasks and less to non-professional tasks than they did in actual practice.

7. Considerable role conflict for librarians would arise as a result of their failure to meet the expectations of teachers on roughly half the task items. Greatest dissatisfaction was expressed in regard to administrative, educational, and technical tasks. Teachers generally felt that librarians should devote more attention to these tasks than they actually did.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order that the school librarian may function more effectively and efficiently and thus make a greater contribution to the educational program, measures designed to minimize role conflict should be adopted. As a result of the present study the following recommendations are made:

1. Librarians should be made aware, in formal and informal study groups, that principals would prefer them to devote less attention to non-professional tasks than they do at present, and that both principals and teachers would like them to place greater stress on educational and administrative tasks than they currently do.

2. Librarians should attempt to find alternate means of getting necessary non-professional tasks done, and devote more of their own time and attention to administrative and educational activities.

3. School boards should provide aides or clerks for the school library in order that the librarian's professional skills and training may not be misused, and that he may perform more effectively in his administrative and educational role.

4. Teachers should be made more cognizant, in the various study groups, of the function of the school librarian in the educational program. They should be made particularly aware that by performing clerical tasks the librarian is undermining his potential in the realm of education.

The findings of this study suggest the need for further research in the field of school librarianship. The following recommendations are therefore made:

1. Research is needed which would examine the role of the school librarian in terms of type and grade level of school.

2. Further study is suggested of the perceptions for the role of the school librarian which are held by the librarian and his referent groups when groups are classified according to variables such as age, sex, experience, training, grade level taught and subject of specialization.

3. It is suggested that the perceptions for the role of the school librarian which are held by other referent groups such as students and parents, be investigated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Elenora. "The Librarian's Multimedia Role." The Instructor, 74:55-6, November 1964.

American Association of School Librarians. Standards for School Library Programs. Chicago: American Library Association, 1960.

American Association of School Librarians and Department of Audiovisual Instruction, National Education Association. Standards for School Media Programs. Chicago: American Library Association, 1969.

American Association of School Librarians. Realization: The Final Report of the Knapp School Library Program. Chicago: American Library Association, 1968.

Argyle, Michael. "The Concept of Role and Status." In Readings in General Psychology, Paul Holmes and Alan Iliffe (Eds.). London: Routledge and Kegan, 1959.

Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education. New York: Random House, 1963.

Canadian School Library Association. Standards of Library Service for Canadian Schools. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1967.

Cannon, Marion. "Role of Secondary School Librarian." New Jersey Libraries, 2:43-4, Summer 1969. pp. 43-4.

Conant, James B. The American High School Today. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Davies, Ruth Ann. The School Library: A Force for Educational Excellence. New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1969.

Delaney, Jack D. The New School Librarian. Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String Press, 1968.

Dewey, John. Experience and Education. New York: Macmillan Co., 1938.

Ellsworth, Ralph E. The School Library. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965.

Fargo, Lucille F. The Library in the School. Chicago: American Library Association, 1947.

- Fast, Betty. "Teachers and Librarians: Stage Managers for the Learning Program." Childhood Education, 43:73-5, October 1966.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1959.
- Frazier, Alexander. "New Trends in Instruction - New Tasks for School Librarians," School Libraries, 12:13-6, January 1963.
- Friderichsen, Blanche. "School Libraries in Alberta." Alberta School Library Review, 6:5-8, Fall 1969.
- Gardiner, Jewel. Administering Library Service in the Elementary School. Chicago: American Library Association, 1954.
- Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958.
- Gaver, Mary V. "Services in Secondary School Media Centers: A Second Appraisal." School Libraries, 20:15-21, Fall 1970.
- _____ and Milbrey L. Jones. "Secondary Library Services: A Search for Essentials." Teachers College Record, 68:200-9, December 1966.
- Getzels, J. W. and E. G. Guba. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process." The School Review, 65:423-41, 1957.
- Gray, William S. "Social and Educational Changes Affecting the Library." In The Library in General Education. Forty-second Yearbook, Part II, of the National Society for the Study of Education. Nelson B. Henry (Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.
- Gross, Neal, Ward S. Mason and Alexander W. McEachern. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1958.
- Homans, George C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1950.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Linton, Ralph. The Study of Man. New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1936.

Manderson, Frances. "The Role of the School Librarian." New Jersey Libraries, 2:41-2, Summer 1969.

McGuire, Alice Brooks. "The Librarian's Role in the Literature Program." Elementary English, 44:468-71,

Melnick Valerie. "The Librarian's Role." Theory into Practice, 6:40-3, February 1967.

National Educational Association of the United States. Project on the Instructional Program of the Public Schools. Planning and Organizing for Teachers. Washington: National Education Association of the United States, 1963.

Nordin, Adelaide Louise. "Teachers' Attitudes towards the School Library." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1968.

Olson, Lowell Ellis. "Teachers', Principals', and Librarians' Perceptions of the School Librarian's Role." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1966.

Operational Research Branch, Department of Education, Government of Alberta. List of Operating Schools in Alberta 1970-1971. (Mimeographed.)

Perrins, W. A. T., "The Changing Role of the School Librarian." Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation Bulletin, vol. 46, no. 2, March 1966. pp. 77-8.

Phenix, Philip H. Realms of Meaning. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1959.

The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America. America at Mid-Century Series, Special Studies Project Report V, Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1959.

Research Division, National Education Association. School Library Personnel Task Analysis Survey. Chicago: American Library Association, 1969.

Saunders, Helen E. The Modern School Library: Its Administration as a Materials Center. Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press Inc., 1968.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956.

- Swarthout, Charlene R. The School Library as Part of the Instructional System. Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press Inc., 1967.
- Trump, J. Lloyd. Guide to Better Schools. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1961.
- Tyler, Ralph W. "The School Librarian's Boss." In The Climate of Book Selection - Social Influences on School and Public Libraries. Berkeley, California: University of California School of Librarianship, 1959.
- Walker, Jerry L. "Changing Attitudes toward the Library and the Librarian." American Library Association Bulletin, 61:977-81, September 1967.
- Warner, John Ellsworth. "The Role of the Librarian as a Co-worker in Guidance from the Viewpoint of the Guidance Worker." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Columbia University, 1963. Dissertation Abstracts 24:2047, 1963.
- Wright, John G., and L. G. Wiedrick. "Survey of School Library Services in Prince George School District No. 57." (Mimeographed.)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A

[illegible]

SECTION B

TASK

RESPONSE (Check one only)

The school librarian

	definitely should not	preferably should not	may or may not	preferably should	definitely should
1. Evaluate and select books and materials.					
2. Become familiar with the educational program and curriculum of the school.					
3. Keep teachers informed regarding new and existing materials in the library.					
4. Catalogue books and other materials (i.e. prepare entries for the catalogue according to an accepted set of catalogue rules).					
5. Arrange the library and its materials for maximum accessibility.					
6. Stamp books in and out at the circulation desk.					
7. Keep records of individual students' reading ability and interests.					
8. Serve as resource consultant on curriculum committees and at department or grade meetings.					
9. Prepare bibliographies for teacher use.					
10. Orient new students in the use of the library.					
11. Classify books and other materials (i.e. categorize them according to content by assigning a Dewey Decimal Classification number).					

	defin- itely should not	prefer- ably should not	may or may not	prefer- ably should	defin- itely should
12. Create an attractive, welcoming atmosphere in the library.					
13. Order and receive books and other materials.					
14. Help teachers to keep informed of current educational developments in their fields by providing relevant materials.					
15. Develop reading lists for students.					
16. Type catalogue cards and book pockets.					
17. Provide personal, social, vocational and educational guidance to students through the provision of suitable materials.					
18. Return books to the shelves after circulation.					
19. Guide students in their choice of books and other materials for recreational use.					
20. Co-ordinate the services of the school library with those of the public library.					
21. Organize audio-visual equipment and oversee its use.					
22. Conduct in-service training programs with teachers in library utilization.					

	defin- ately should not	prefer- ably should not	may or may not	prefer- ably should	defin- itely should
23. In co-operation with the administration and staff, formulate a library policy statement (i.e. a statement of the philosophy of the library).					
24. Instruct students in the library skills including the use of the card catalogue, reference books and magazine indexes.					
25. Write notices to students for overdue books.					
26. Plan with the administration and staff for the integration of the library program into the total educational scheme.					
27. Guide students in the development of critical judgment in their reading, viewing, and listening.					
28. Assume responsibility for discipline of students using the library.					
29. Work with teachers in the planning of instructional units to foster optimum use of the available materials and integration of library skills with classroom work.					
30. Instruct students in the study skills such as scanning, summarizing, notemaking and outlining.					
31. Repair worn books and put plastic covers on new ones.					

	definitely should not	preferably should not	may or may not	preferably should	definitely should
32. Serve as resource person in in the classroom when instructional units involve the library.					
33. Publicize and promote the library program (i.e. the program of instruction, services and activities which the library provides to students and teachers) by such means as displays, bulletins, and personal contact.					
34. Guide students in their choice of materials for research.					
35. Provide group reading guidance through book talks, group discussions, story-telling and other enrichment and motivational activities.					
36. Assist teachers in the production of materials.					
37. Involve teachers in evaluation and selection of books and other materials.					
38. Past book pockets in books.					
39. Organize and oversee the processing (i.e. preparation for use) of books and other materials.					
40. Weed the collection periodically and discard obsolete or unnecessary materials.					

	defin- itely should not	prefer- ably should not	may or may not	prefer- ably should	defin- itely should
41. Prepare statistical, financial and progress reports on the operation of the library.					
42. Locate information for students.					
43. Evaluate the library program, services, and materials in terms of staff and student needs and of the Canadian standards.					
44. Make provision for the use of the library by classes, groups and individuals.					
45. Prepare and administer the library budget.					
46. Assist students to gain skill in the inquiry technique by providing the materials, facilities and climate necessary to this type of learning.					
47. Integrate group and individual instruction in library skills with classroom work.					
48. Plan library quarters and facilities for new or renovated libraries.					
49. In co-operation with teachers, plan and implement a library program.					
50. Clip and mount materials for the pamphlet file.					

	defin- itely should not	prefer- ably should not	may or may not	prefer- ably should	defin- itely should
51. Accommodate and supervise students taking a spare and doing work which does not require the library's resources.					
52. Organize and oversee the circulation of library materials.					
53. Train and supervise all paid, volunteer, and/or student assistants.					
54. Check the shelves to see that books are in the correct order.					
55. Provide teachers with information concerning students' abilities and skills as revealed in library use.					

APPENDIX B

(COPY OF LETTER SENT TO PANEL MEMBERS)

12511 - 40 Ave.
Edmonton, Alberta
April 9, 1971.

Dear

I have undertaken an investigation of the role of the school librarian in Alberta as perceived by principals, teachers and librarians. This study is part of a master's program in Secondary Education at the University of Alberta. Mr. L. G. Wiedrick is official adviser for this study; however, Dr. J. B. Bell is serving in this capacity during his absence.

My purpose in writing to you is to request your co-operation in assisting to refine the enclosed instrument before its distribution to a sample of teachers, principals and librarians. This questionnaire, which is to be used to gather data, elicits responses regarding the degree to which various tasks of the school librarian are felt by the three groups to be obligatory. It also determines the degree to which these tasks are actually performed as reported by the librarian. The tasks have been chosen from three categories of librarian performance; educational, administrative, and technical. A fourth category of non-professional tasks is included in order to ascertain whether or not respondents expect librarians to fulfill these functions, and whether librarians do in fact perform them. I would appreciate your comments on the clarity of the statements, the appropriateness of the tasks, and the comprehensiveness of the questionnaire.

You will perform a most valuable service for my by giving this matter your consideration and returning the questionnaire with your comments in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Yours very sincerely,

H. Audrey Reid

(COPY OF LETTER SENT TO SUPERINTENDENTS IN WHOSE JURISDICTIONS
THE SAMPLE SCHOOLS WERE LOCATED)

12511 - 40 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
April 25, 1971.

Dear

I am conducting a study of the role of the school librarian in Alberta in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education at the University of Alberta. The study attempts to determine the perceptions which principals, teachers and librarians hold for that role. Dr. J. B. Bell is acting as advisor for this investigation.

The sample is to be drawn from sixty Alberta schools randomly selected from among those employing a full time librarian. Since a few schools in your jurisdiction are included in the sample, I wish to request your permission to contact the principals, librarians, and selected teachers in those schools.

As I hope to gather my data before school closes in June, an early reply to this request would be most helpful. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for this purpose. Your co-operation is greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

H. Audrey Reid

(LETTER FROM SCHOOL LIBRARIES CONSULTANT ENCLOSED IN
CORRESPONDENCE SENT TO PRINCIPALS)

GOVERNMENT OF THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

818, Administration
Building,
10820 - 98th Avenue,
EDMONTON, Alberta.

April 22nd., 1971.

Mrs. J. Reid,
12511 - 40 Ave.,
EDMONTON.

Dear Mrs. Reid:

Your proposed study on the role of the school librarian will most certainly be of value to the Canadian Educational scene. A definition of the "new" school librarian may be one of the catalysts for the hiring of competent personnel for school libraries.

I am confident the schools receiving your carefully prepared questionnaire will cooperate in the study.

Yours sincerely,

Blanche Friderichsen

(Mrs.) Blanche Friderichsen
School Libraries Consultant.

BF/jmh.

ENCL

(COPY OF LETTER SENT TO PRINCIPALS INCLUDED IN THIS STUDY)

12511 - 40 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
May 20, 1971

Dear Sir:

I am conducting a study of the role of the school librarian in Alberta in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education at the University of Alberta. Your school is among sixty which have been randomly selected from all Alberta schools employing full time librarians. The principal, librarian, and a small number of teachers in each school are asked to participate. Your superintendent has granted me permission to conduct this study in your area, and Mrs. Blanche Friderichsen, Provincial School Library Consultant, has provided me with the enclosed letter indicating her support for the study.

You are requested to complete Item V only of Section A and all of Section B of the enclosed questionnaire. It should take no more than fifteen minutes of your time. In Section B, please consider each task not in terms of whether it should be performed, but rather in terms of whether it should be performed by the librarian. Then indicate, in the appropriate space, the degree to which you feel each task to be obligatory.

Would you also be so kind as to distribute the enclosed envelopes to your librarian and to the specified teachers. If the name of the librarian is incorrect, please give it to the person presently filling that position. I have requested teachers and librarians to return the completed questionnaires to you by June 15. I would appreciate it if you would forward the completed questionnaires to me in the stamped self-addressed envelope provided.

I regret that this request comes at such a busy time of year and I thank you most sincerely for your co-operation and assistance. A summary of the results of this study will be forwarded to you when they become available.

Yours truly,

H. Audrey Reid

(COPY OF LETTER SENT TO SCHOOL LIBRARIANS INCLUDED IN THE STUDY)

12511 - 40 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
May 20, 1971

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am conducting a study of the role of the school librarian in Alberta which attempts to determine how teachers, principals and librarians view the tasks of the librarian. It is hoped that clarification of this role will aid librarians in performing it more effectively.

Your assistance in this study is requested through the completion of the enclosed questionnaire. It should require no more than fifteen minutes of your time. Please complete all of Section A except Item II, and all of Section B.

In the spaces on the right hand side of Section B you are asked to record the degree to which you feel each of the tasks to be obligatory. Please consider each task not in terms of whether it should be performed, but rather whether it should be performed by the librarian. In the spaces on the left hand side please register the degree to which you actually perform each of the tasks. It is anticipated that, because of such factors as lack of time and clerical help, the actual role performance will not meet the ideal, and that the responses on the two sides may differ somewhat.

Would you please return the completed questionnaire to your principal by June 15. Your name is not required, and the questionnaires will not be identified with any individuals or schools.

Thank-you most sincerely for your co-operation.

Yours truly,

H. Audrey Reid

(COPY OF LETTER SENT TO TEACHERS INCLUDED IN THIS STUDY)

12511 - 40 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
May 20, 1971.

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am conducting a study of the role of the school librarian in Alberta which is designed to determine how teachers, principals and librarians view the tasks of the librarian. It is hoped that clarification of this role will aid in its performance.

Your are requested to assist in this study by completing the enclosed questionnaire. It should take no more than fifteen minutes of your time. Please complete all of Sections A and B. In Section B, please consider each task not in terms of whether it should be performed, but rather whether it should be performed by the librarian. Then indicate, in the appropriate space, the degree to which you feel each task to be obligatory.

Please return the completed questionnaire to your principal by June 15. Your name is not required, and the questionnaires will not be identified with any individuals or schools.

Thank-you most sincerely for your co-operation.

Yours truly,

H. Audrey Reid

APPENDIX C

TABLE I

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 1:
Evaluate and select books and other materials.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	5	6	39	50	10
Principals	0	0	11	17	28	56	16
Teachers	1	5	38	32	38	114	26
Librarians (Actual)	0	0	3	23	24	50	7

TABLE II

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 2:
Become familiar with the educational program and curriculum
of the school.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	0	6	44	40	1
Principals	0	0	2	9	45	56	4
Teachers	0	0	1	27	86	114	4
Librarians (Actual)	0	0	3	21	26	50	4

TABLE III

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 3:
Keep teachers informed regarding new and existing materials
in the library.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	1	6	43	50	3
Principals	0	0	1	7	48	56	1
Teachers	0	0	3	18	93	114	1
Librarians (Actual)	0	0	4	25	21	50	8

TABLE IV

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 4:
Catalogue books and other materials (i.e. prepare entries for
the catalogue according to an accepted set of catalogue rules).

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	5	8	14	2	21	50	41
Principals	4	9	10	7	26	56	33
Teachers	6	5	18	9	76	114	15
Librarians (Actual)	8	9	12	2	19	50	30

TABLE V

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 5:
Arrange the library and its materials for maximum accessibility.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	1	0	5	7	37	50	12
Principals	0	3	2	10	41	56	7
Teachers	0	2	2	14	96	114	2
Librarians (Actual)	0	1	1	18	30	50	3

TABLE VI

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 6:
Stamp books in and out at the circulation desk.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	14	19	13	2	2	50	49
Principals	11	21	19	2	3	56	49
Teachers	16	23	47	12	16	114	48
Librarians (Actual)	3	10	22	10	5	50	40

TABLE VII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 7:
Keep records of individual students' reading ability and interests.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	6	4	25	11	4	50	45
Principals	7	10	28	11	0	56	46
Teachers	22	24	53	15	0	114	53
Librarians (Actual)	18	14	15	2	1	50	54

TABLE VIII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 8:
Serve as resource consultant on curriculum committees and at department or grade meetings.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	2	3	15	30	50	16
Principals	0	1	12	21	22	56	21
Teachers	0	2	33	48	31	114	25
Librarians (Actual)	7	12	20	10	1	50	45

TABLE IX

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 9:
Prepare bibliographies for teacher use.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	8	19	23	50	23
Principals	1	4	7	29	15	56	28
Teachers	5	3	47	39	20	114	37
Librarians (Actual)	5	5	18	17	5	50	33

TABLE X

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 10:
Orient new students in the use of the library.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	3	10	37	50	8
Principals	0	0	5	17	34	56	10
Teachers	0	1	13	29	71	114	5
Librarians (Actual)	0	1	6	18	25	50	9

TABLE XI

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 11:
Classify books and other materials (i.e. categorize them
according to content by assigning a Dewey Decimal
Classification number).

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	3	14	10	5	18	50	43
Principals	3	6	10	11	26	56	29
Teachers	6	1	20	19	68	114	16
Librarians (Actual)	10	8	9	4	19	50	32

TABLE XII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 12:
Create an attractive, welcoming atmosphere in the library.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	1	6	43	50	4
Principals	0	0	1	9	46	56	3
Teachers	0	0	3	21	90	114	3
Librarians (Actual)	0	1	4	28	17	50	11

TABLE XIII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 13:
Order and receive books and other materials.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	4	3	3	13	27	50	30
Principals	2	5	8	22	19	56	30
Teachers	2	3	19	36	54	114	19
Librarians (Actual)	1	1	3	15	30	50	6

TABLE XIV

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 14:
Help teachers to keep informed of current educational
developments in their fields by providing relevant materials.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	2	0	6	21	21	50	29
Principals	0	1	7	29	19	56	20
Teachers	1	1	27	44	41	114	22
Librarians (Actual)	1	10	17	18	4	50	31

TABLE XV

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 15:
Develop reading lists for students.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	2	4	12	24	8	50	39
Principals	0	3	18	27	8	56	35
Teachers	4	8	45	40	17	114	38
Librarians (Actual)	9	9	23	7	2	50	46

TABLE XVI

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 16:
Type catalogue cards and book pockets.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	35	8	5	0	2	50	54
Principals	25	21	7	0	3	56	52
Teachers	28	21	39	10	16	114	49
Librarians (Actual)	23	8	10	5	4	50	52

TABLE XVII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 17:
Provide personal, social, vocational and educational guidance
to students through the provision of suitable materials.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	9	21	20	50	27
Principals	2	2	19	23	10	56	36
Teachers	9	8	26	48	23	114	36
Librarians (Actual)	1	5	20	18	6	50	25

TABLE XVIII

Frequency distribution of response by groups for Task 18:
Return books to the shelves after circulation.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	23	14	10	1	2	50	51
Principals	24	19	10	0	3	56	51
Teachers	24	23	44	13	10	114	50
Librarians (Actual)	7	10	18	9	6	50	43

TABLE XIX

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 19:
Guide students in their choice of books and other materials
for recreational use.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	1	6	13	30	50	20
Principals	0	0	11	28	17	56	23
Teachers	1	2	20	58	33	114	24
Librarians (Actual)	0	2	14	24	10	50	19

TABLE XX

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 20:
Co-ordinate the services of the school library with those of
the public library.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	1	1	17	24	7	50	37
Principals	1	2	23	21	9	56	38
Teachers	1	3	46	44	20	114	33
Librarians (Actual)	12	20	15	2	1	50	51

TABLE XXI

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 21:
Organize audio-visual equipment and oversee its use.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	2	7	10	16	15	50	38
Principals	5	9	15	20	7	56	42
Teachers	11	21	37	31	14	114	45
Librarians (Actual)	2	3	11	15	19	50	16

TABLE XXII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 22:
Conduct in-service training programs with teachers in
library utilization

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	2	0	10	21	17	50	33
Principals	1	0	9	28	18	56	24
Teachers	1	0	46	47	20	114	31
Librarians (Actual)	12	17	14	5	2	50	50

TABLE XXIII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 23:
In co-operation with the administration and staff, formulate
a library policy statement (i.e. a statement of the philosophy
of the library).

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	1	1	5	13	30	50	22
Principals	0	0	3	24	29	56	12
Teachers	0	0	16	52	46	114	14
Librarians (Actual)	11	7	9	13	10	50	37

TABLE XXIV

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 24:
Instruct students in the library skills including the use of
the card catalogue, reference books and magazine indexes.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	2	8	50	50	5
Principals	0	0	2	16	38	56	6
Teachers	0	2	13	33	66	114	7
Librarians (Actual)	0	2	1	19	28	50	5

TABLE XXV

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 25:
Write notices to students for overdue books.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	22	10	11	2	5	50	50
Principals	14	18	19	2	3	56	50
Teachers	16	18	45	17	18	114	47
Librarians (Actual)	10	9	9	11	11	50	38

TABLE XXVI

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 26:
Plan with the administration and staff for the integration of
the library program into the total educational scheme.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	2	10	38	50	6
Principals	0	0	0	9	47	56	2
Teachers	1	0	7	45	61	114	6
Librarians (Actual)	2	11	12	18	7	50	28

TABLE XXVII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 27:
Guide students in the development of critical judgment in
their reading, viewing, and listening.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	16	21	13	50	34
Principals	1	3	14	29	9	56	34
Teachers	7	12	47	31	17	114	41
Librarians (Actual)	3	11	23	11	2	50	42

TABLE XXVIII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 28:
Assume responsibility for discipline of students using the library.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	6	7	15	7	15	50	44
Principals	4	6	17	21	8	56	41
Teachers	11	12	32	30	29	114	39
Librarians (Actual)	2	2	16	12	18	50	20

TABLE XXIX

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 29:
Work with teachers in the planning of instructional units to foster optimum use of available materials and integration of library skills with classroom work.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	0	14	36	50	7
Principals	0	0	5	21	30	56	13
Teachers	0	3	20	58	33	114	23
Librarians (Actual)	2	8	12	23	5	50	26

TABLE XXX

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 30:
Instruct students in the study skills such as scanning, summarizing, notemaking and outlining.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	5	9	24	7	5	50	46
Principals	7	12	22	11	4	56	45
Teachers	23	27	46	11	7	114	51
Librarians (Actual)	14	17	16	2	1	50	53

TABLE XXXI

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 31:
Repair worn books and put plastic covers on new ones.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	30	9	3	4	5	50	52
Principals	26	19	9	1	1	56	53
Teachers	32	23	35	9	15	114	52
Librarians	12	10	11	7	10	50	44

TABLE XXXII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 32:
Serve as resource person in the classroom when instructional
units involve the library

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	1	1	10	20	18	50	32
Principals	0	5	11	26	14	56	31
Teachers	1	6	36	45	26	114	30
Librarians (Actual)	12	15	9	9	5	50	47

TABLE XXXIII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 33:
Publicize and promote the library program (i.e. the program of
instruction, services and activities which the library provides
to students and teachers) by such means as displays,
bulletins, and personal contact.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	1	0	2	19	28	50	17
Principals	0	0	0	18	38	56	5
Teachers	0	2	7	56	49	114	9
Librarians (Actual)	1	3	7	28	11	50	17

TABLE XXXIV

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 34:
Guide students in their choice of materials for research,

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	4	16	30	50	13
Principals	0	0	9	21	26	56	17
Teachers	0	3	14	57	40	114	20
Librarians (Actual)	0	1	7	24	18	50	13

TABLE XXXV

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 35:
Provide group reading guidance through book talks, group
discussions, story telling and other enrichment and
motivational activities.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	11	13	26	50	24
Principals	1	4	9	24	18	56	26
Teachers	3	7	29	44	31	114	27
Librarians (Actual)	10	7	12	11	10	50	39

TABLE XXVI

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 36:
Assist teachers in the production of materials.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	1	3	25	14	7	50	42
Principals	3	10	26	13	4	56	43
Teachers	7	10	61	25	11	114	43
Librarians (Actual)	7	17	22	3	1	50	48

TABLE XXXVII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 37:
Involve teachers in evaluation and selection of books and
other materials.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	1	3	18	28	50	18
Principals	0	0	5	26	25	56	14
Teachers	0	2	13	60	39	114	18
Librarians (Actual)	1	3	10	24	12	50	18

TABLE XXXVIII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 38:
Paste book pockets in books.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	37	7	4	1	1	50	55
Principals	39	9	4	2	2	56	54
Teachers	35	26	38	1	14	114	54
Librarians (Actual)	18	10	13	3	6	50	49

TABLE XXXIX

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 39:
Organize and oversee the processing (i.e. preparation for
use) of books and other materials.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	5	7	6	16	16	50	40
Principals	6	9	11	15	15	56	40
Teachers	5	9	24	44	32	114	29
Librarians (Actual)	8	1	5	13	23	50	21

TABLE XL

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 40:
Weed the collection periodically and discard obsolete or
unnecessary materials.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	2	13	35	50	9
Principals	0	1	2	21	32	56	11
Teachers	1	3	9	47	54	114	10
Librarians (Actual)	0	2	7	20	21	50	12

TABLE XLI

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 41:
Prepare statistical, financial and progress reports on the
operation of the library.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	1	3	9	15	22	50	31
Principals	1	6	19	15	15	56	37
Teachers	2	13	35	34	30	114	35
Librarians (Actual)	4	3	10	14	19	50	22

TABLE XLII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 42:
Locate information for students.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	1	8	11	14	16	50	36
Principals	7	10	22	13	4	56	44
Teachers	8	18	39	30	19	114	42
Librarians (Actual)	0	2	13	22	13	50	15

TABLE XLIII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 43:
Evaluate the library program, services, and materials in
terms of staff and student needs and of the Canadian standards.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	4	17	29	50	15
Principals	0	1	3	27	25	56	15
Teachers	0	2	15	47	50	114	13
Librarians (Actual)	3	6	18	14	9	50	27

TABLE XLIV

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 44:
Make provision for the use of the library by classes, groups
and individuals.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	1	0	5	44	50	2
Principals	0	0	3	21	32	56	9
Teachers	1	1	9	43	60	114	8
Librarians (Actual)	2	0	3	7	38	50	2

TABLE XLV

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 45:
Prepare and administer the library budget.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	1	2	7	13	27	50	26
Principals	0	6	13	26	11	56	32
Teachers	7	4	36	32	35	114	32
Librarians (Actual)	10	1	7	12	20	50	23

TABLE XLVI

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 46: Assist students to gain skill in the inquiry technique by providing the materials, facilities and climate necessary to this type of learning.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	1	19	30	50	11
Principals	0	1	4	29	22	56	18
Teachers	0	8	10	52	44	114	21
Librarians (Actual)	0	2	6	25	17	50	14

TABLE XLVII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 47: Integrate group and individual instruction in library skills with classroom work.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	1	1	4	22	22	50	25
Principals	1	3	9	24	19	56	25
Teachers	2	5	40	46	21	114	34
Librarians (Actual)	5	10	17	10	8	50	36

TABLE XLVIII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 48: Plan library quarters and facilities for new or renovated libraries.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	1	11	14	24	50	28
Principals	1	2	12	24	17	56	27
Teachers	1	3	42	39	29	114	28
Librarians (Actual)	26	7	9	6	2	50	55

TABLE XLIX

Frequency distribution of response by groups for Task 49:
In co-operation with teachers, plan and implement a library program.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	1	2	18	29	50	14
Principals	0	0	3	20	33	56	8
Teachers	0	0	11	59	44	114	12
Librarians (Actual)	4	7	11	18	10	50	24

TABLE L

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 50:
Clip and mount materials for the pamphlet file.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	14	10	10	8	8	50	47
Principals	13	12	19	11	1	56	48
Teachers	13	15	51	21	14	114	46
Librarians (Actual)	6	7	16	21	9	50	34

TABLE LI

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 51:
Accommodate and supervise students taking a "spare" and doing other work which does not require the library's resources.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	29	10	6	4	1	50	53
Principals	34	16	4	1	1	56	55
Teachers	69	19	17	8	1	114	55
Librarians (Actual)	6	11	14	8	11	50	35

TABLE LII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 52:
Organize and oversee the circulation of library materials.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	1	4	16	29	50	19
Principals	0	4	2	25	25	56	19
Teachers	2	1	7	54	50	114	11
Librarians (Actual)	0	0	1	14	35	50	1

TABLE LIII

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 53:
Train and supervise all paid, volunteer, and/or student
assistants.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	0	8	13	29	50	21
Principals	0	1	10	26	19	56	22
Teachers	3	2	13	44	52	114	17
Librarians (Actual)	3	0	4	17	26	50	10

TABLE LIV

Frequency distribution of responses by groups for Task 54:
Check the shelves to see that books are in the correct order.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	13	10	13	6	8	50	48
Principals	11	14	19	8	4	56	47
Teachers	14	17	37	28	18	114	44
Librarians (Actual)	2	14	11	11	12	50	29

TABLE IV

Frequency distribution of response by groups for Task 55:
Provide teachers with information concerning students' abilities and skills as revealed in library use.

Group	Response Category					N	Ranking
	1	2	3	4	5		
Librarians (Ideal)	0	2	15	22	11	50	35
Principals	3	3	19	25	6	56	39
Teachers	7	9	45	37	16	114	40
Librarians (Actual)	6	9	18	11	6	50	41

B29999